This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

43.1053.

MAMMO-MANIA:

THE

APOSTACY OF THE AGE

UNVEILED.

Third Edition.

DEDICATED TO SIR ROBERT PEEL, BART.

FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY, &c.

BY ANTI-MAMMON.

"The Press has now become the Pioneer of the Christian Dispensation."

"Ephraim is joined to Idols."—Hosea, iv, 17.

LONDON:
SAMUEL CLARKE, 13 PALL MALL EAST.
1843.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY CHARLES REYNELL,
LITTLE PULTENEY STREET.

INSCRIBED TO THE PREMIER,

THE

RIGHT HON. SIR R. PEEL, BART.

FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY,

&c. &c. &c.

Sir,

We take the liberty of dedicating this present publication to you, because you occupy, not only the most important and influential, but assuredly also the most *responsible* position in the State. The wealth of the State constitutes its strength and its glory, and to you, as First Lord of the Treasury, belongs the greatest influence in the general regulation of that wealth. How you gained your present pre-eminence, and how you are fulfilling the onerous duties which it entailed upon you, are points on which we scruple not to speak as we conscientiously feel.

By your "No Confidence" motion you ejected your predecessor in office, and stepped into his

place; but the proceeding seemed, to our humble understandings, to express little of your actual and ulterior object, and simply to imply *Nulla fides in Russello, sed plena fides in Peelo?* So the nation took you on trust, and the event has proved that a fuller explanation of your intentions would have been more satisfactory both for yourself and for us.

You succeeded, and became (according to your own chosen figure of speech) the First State Physician.

We now proceed to ask—What have you done, and what are you doing? What measures are you prescribing to remove, or even alleviate, the alarming malady under which you found your patient, the State, to be suffering?

It is on the ground of your official *responsibility* that we take our stand whilst we venture to address you in the language of bold expostulation. The times we live in make heavy, indeed, this responsibility upon all those to whom, like yourself, great gifts have been bestowed. The Redeemer's maxim, "Unto whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more," is no dead letter. He that

flinches from its application gives evidence, in so doing, of his own great defection.

When first you took up the reins of Government, we heard you say that you would begin by taxing the rich to relieve the poor, and we were truly glad to find you thus starting out in the right direction. Alas! how soon you lost your way. Instead of taxing the rich to relieve the poor, in reality you have fabricated a new system of taxation which, whilst it pretends to effect your object, carries *fraud upon its face.* You call your new tax a *property* tax, whilst, in fact, it is an impost upon *income,*— a levy made upon men's earnings, if those earnings amount to a specified sum. Those who do not gain 150*l.* a year are *professedly* exempt from the tax, but are not so in reality. By an act of pure despotism, you have placed on every public creditor, even the widow with her paltry annuity of 5*l.*, your sevenpenny imposition. To these victims you promise redress, and talk of refunding! but well you know that many of those persons of very slender incomes, whom you have so mulcted of their little pittance, will be compelled by circumstances to submit to the wrong and robbery thus committed upon them, rather than pass through the

ordeal of those inquisitorial assessors, commissioners, and others, which you have appointed. Many also of aged men and bed-ridden women must of necessity suffer your imposition. But assuming the act of future retribution, with its long train of trouble and vexation, effected, it can never justify a present act of despotic spoliation. Moreover, Sir, how is it that you have, perforce of a law which received the Royal sanction in the month of June only, mulcted the people with your sevenpence in the pound upon all their earnings for the whole of the last half year? Here again appear promises of refunding and restitution at some future period; but again we say, such promises do not justify these arbitrary acts of despotism and injustice. Many of us will be quite out of the reach of your promise at the time appointed for its fulfilment.

These are not the only instances of your betrayal of the confidence the nation bestowed on you. Your approval of the New Poor Laws,—of the deprivation of all paupers of their vested rights and interests acquired under Acts of Parliament passed in by-gone times,—amounts, in our estimation, to as complete a case of despotism,—of the exercise of might over right,—

as the worst part of our history can show. Let us remind you that one of the most enlightened men of the age,—the highest authority of the land,—the late Lord High Chancellor Eldon, denounced this New Poor Law as the most *atrocious* act of aggression committed against the poor. In terms not less condemnatory the opinions of other astute *jurists* of the day have been expressed on this "atrocious" law. Yet do you, Sir, as the Premier, uphold it with all the influence of your Government. At the elections you suffered your adherents to create far other hopes, when the seals of office were the stakes you were playing for.

Again, Sir, we impugn your indifference, not to say opposition, to the benevolent schemes of the kind-hearted and pious Lord Ashley, formed for the purpose of delivering poor women and infant children from factory slavery, and from dark and under-ground labour. Such conduct, we submit, must ever remain an indelible blot upon your escutcheon. It reminds us, too, how little you can conquer the prejudices almost inherent in you, and of the truth of the fact that you owe all your greatness and elevation in the world principally to your wealth,—to wealth wrung from the vitals of little children

under the now condemned, and always accursed, factory systems. Would it not otherwise be most strange, almost incredible, that because Lord Ashley was determined to persevere in his endeavours to emancipate all this inhuman thraldom and misery, that *therefore* he could not become a fitting member of your newly-formed Administration? Who shall account for this? Our rude apothegm,—Mammon, a sorcerer,—resolves it all.

How to depose this sorcerer, and thereby to clear the way for the advance of the Christian Dispensation now upon the earth, whilst it is an object worthy of the highest talents and most exalted intellects, is, nevertheless, a work in which it may please the Lord Jehovah to employ the most insignificant agency.—[I Corinthians, i, 26.]

We have alluded to certain specimens only of your *political morality;* we might add to them, but they are already enough to prove the truth of the lesson we learnt at school from the Spanish novel 'Gil Blas,'—that "An honest politician is a mere scrupulous fool."

But farther, Sir, it is said that you are a man

of prayer. We are sorry to hear it, because it is clear that, being a professed Conservative, you cannot pray for the first of Christian boons. *Esto perpetua* to things as they are must be the burden of your prayers. You cannot ask, or expect, that the existing state of affairs amongst us should undergo such a change as that the will of your Heavenly Father may be done on earth even as it is by ministering angels in heaven, or that the Messiah's kingdom may completely supersede and abolish our present Mammonian institutions and contrivances. We consequently deprecate your piety, because Christianity must continue to be treated, even by you, *as a man of piety*, not as the all in all, but as "part and parcel of the law of the land,"—that is, a useful but subordinate adjunct to the British Constitution! We take the liberty to observe that you have much to learn. You have to know, not only that "Christian is the highest style of Man," but that he is an empty pretender to philosophy that thinks he can resolve the major into the minor in his politics, and is no sincere Christian who would make the Redeemer's Dispensation an aliquot part of any human institution whatever.

This, it appears to us, is a sad bill of indictment to be preferred against a gentleman of your rank, standing, and endowments; but, Sir, the only question we care about is, Are the allegations *true*,—are you fairly and properly exposed to these animadversions? Because if our statements be all TRUTH, it follows of course that such TRUTH ought to be brought to light and made manifest. Finesse and manœuvre in politics must all be exposed and exploded; a simulated Christianity must be condemned; and the reign of MAMMON in the land must be denounced;—*must*, we say, so long as these things stand palpable and impassable barriers in the way of the Messiah's kingdom on earth. We know, Sir, that you may produce high authority in upholding that spurious Christianity of which we speak. It is gravely asked by us, the common people, whether our pastors and masters, whether our leaders in the Church, as well as in the State, are not all confederate with you against the advance of the Christian Dispensation on the earth; a dispensation of regeneration and deliverance for all mankind, both for TIME, and for eternity: for time *antecedent* to eternity. We know not whether to call our archbishops and bishops true and faithful

Christians, or mere non-doing, self-seeking, and Mammon-serving professors. It seems as if they based their faith on palaces and mansions; on cathedrals, churches, and chapels; on ordinances and sacraments; on forms and ceremonies; rather than on the rock of ages, the fundamental principles of the Messiah's kingdom. By their fruits we venture to judge of them. Our Divine Teacher has removed all obscurity from this inquiry, "If any man will *do* he shall *know*."

We are always perplexed and much puzzled when we behold, and when we hear of, the elegancies and luxuries which surround the persons of our great ecclesiastical leaders. We cannot help drawing a *contrast* in all these things, between their lives and that of the Divine Exemplar, whose ministers they are called, and whose followers they profess to be. The great sorcerer Mammon has surely bewitched them; so that instead of making their lives subservient to the Christian cause, they appear to us to be even more the slaves and worshippers of the evil one than other men are. Long prayers and much preaching are, to our eyes, but as a specious show; a deceitful varnish. Indeed it appears manifest to us that the Church

itself, in some of its formularies, repudiates that hope of our calling, of which we have spoken, that temporal triumph of Christianity over all opposition. The collect tells us that the second advent of the Messiah will be at the day of judgment. None of the creeds even touch upon the great consummation we anticipate. Ancient prophecy seems, to our most orthodox priesthood, as a sealed book. Insomuch that if our Divine Master himself had not plainly predicted such a state of things, *in futuro*, for us, the hope and expectation itself would, ere this, no doubt, have been entirely obsolete. Yet so long as the sincere Christian continues to pray for it,—to pray that the Messiah's kingdom may come; and that the WILL of THE MOST HIGH may be done on earth; the world will not relinquish the expectation.

It is manifest that you, Sir, as the great State Physician, do not perceive the leading phenomena of that mortal malady, which shakes the commonwealth of this kingdom to its heart's core. You do not observe the enormous and unnatural disparity which prevails in the distribution of nature's gifts. A gracious Providence sends *abundance* for each and all; whilst cunning men have made laws which produce plethora in the few and leanness in the many.

Thousands are gloated to repletion, whilst tens of thousands are languishing in penury and destitution. The malady stops not there; our case indeed is far worse; who can tell to what extent crimes of every description have been first engendered, and then multiplied, and are still multiplying, by this most unnatural and horrible state of affairs? The Rev. Sydney Smith once told Lord Liverpool to his face, when he was Prime Minister, that at the great day of Assize, *the Government*, tolerating these things, will be made to answer for very much of that crime, which they punish on the governed.

In conclusion, Sir, we urge you to consider whether you have not been altogether mistaken in your views of the malady under which your patient, the State, is now labouring; and that, whilst you have been providing very elaborate means for a very complicated case, mere common-sense measures and common honesty, in the use of means, were all that was wanted. Thus: Will you admit one great preliminary fact, to wit, that Providence does send into the world such a plenty of the necessaries and good things of life, that every living being may have a *competency*?

And that a competency with content is happiness to man.

2. Is it not manifest that if one man has contrived to possess himself of the shares of one hundred, that the ninety-nine must be destitute?

3. Is not this the malady—the great political evil—of our times? And is not the natural remedy obvious at once to every man of good sound common sense, and common honesty of purpose?

We ask, Sir, at least a *competency* for every willing labouring man;—that is, enough to maintain a home, a wife, and as many children as it may please Providence to bestow upon him. Thus much we assert he is entitled to, by a law that is more sacred, more ancient, and more irreversible, than any by which you hold your large possessions. A *competency* for every one, from the Sovereign to the humblest artificer, and this we insist the bounty of God has provided.

Mr S. Crawford, in the House of Commons, 19th July, 1842 (see 'Times' report), said, "The

income of England was 166,000,000*l.*, which was derived from the labouring poor; surely it was just, that out of this enormous sum a sufficient provision should be supplied to protect them from starvation. One shilling in the pound on that sum would raise 8,300,000*l.*"

The means of effecting this more equable, more healthful, and more natural state of things, are under your own control. In the first place, tax every rich man according to the superfluity or overabundance of his wealth; and apply the resources so obtained to "lift the poor out of the dust, and the beggar from the dunghill." And in the second place, legislate so that all the working classes shall have *restored* to them that participation in the profits of their labour, which nature, and the God of nature, gives to them. [Deut. xxv, 4.] You may then make soldiers of your policemen, and turn your workhouses and prisons into warehouses. "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn."

These remedial measures, set about in right earnest, and carried on in a true Christian spirit, with a full dependence of grace from above to guide you in all difficulties, would, we are per-

suaded, make your work perfect, and moreover, would hand your name down to posterity, not only as the best of patriots and benefactors, but also as a good and faithful Christian.

And now, Sir, before bidding you farewell, we would admit our consciousness that we are obnoxious to the charge of presumption, in venturing thus to call in question the wisdom and the integrity of those who have the rule over us. Permit us to plead in reply, that we believe the principles which we have enunciated to be great, fundamental, and salutary TRUTHS; and that the proper TIME has arrived for their promulgation.

We look up to the Great Disposer of all events, and pray that you, Sir, may have grace from above to "*eschew evil and do good, to seek peace and ensue it;*" so that the great *realities* of the Christian Dispensation may be daily more and more magnified in your estimation, and made more and more available in the land; and so we subscribe ourselves

Your most obedient, humble Servants.

MAMMO-MANIA.

SECTION I.

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS.

"THERE will come a time," said the venerable Hooker, "when three words of charity and meekness shall do more on the earth than thousands of folio volumes." We trust it is in this spirit that we present the following pages to public attention, although we have felt it to be our duty to speak boldly and decisively upon a subject, beyond all others, the most momentous. It is conference, not controversy, that we solicit with the reader. And this conference we propose should be based on Christian principles exclusively. It does not, however, follow that none but true believers can enter into the merits of the discussion. But, on the contrary, we solicit the attention of every man of good, sound, common sense, as fully competent to the inquiry; assuming only for the occasion that Christianity is true, and that, being true, it must be pre-eminent and paramount in all that it predicates, unfolds, prescribes, or demands.

Some years ago the Lord Bishop of London published a letter addressed to the inhabitants of London and Westminster, in which he maintained that the wealth of the world is bestowed *as a favour from Almighty God*, as a boon from Heaven to those who, like himself, possess it in great abundance. The following are the Bishop's own words:—

"It is not principally to the lower orders of society that the following observations are addressed; it is rather to those who, by a proper use of the *worldly advantages which* God has given them," &c.—(Letter, p. 5.)

"To the observations which follow I request the particular attention of those amongst you who move in the higher walks of life; and who, in proportion to your elevation above the bulk of the community, are under a more fearful responsibility for the use of your *worldly advantages* to HIM *who has intrusted them to your management.*"—(Letter, p. 18.)

Now this is plain language, easily understood; it is, moreover, spontaneously sent to us; it comes to us as the voice of high authority; and it is put forth ostensibly "in the cause of God and his Gospel."

The proposition of the Lord Bishop we presumed publicly to controvert* immediately after its promulga-

* This was done in a pamphlet with the following title:—'Riches. Who is the Dispenser of Riches? A question of vital Christianity,

tion. We asserted our conviction that the sentiment of the learned and dignified prelate is wholly at variance with Gospel truth; that is, contrary to the plainest testimony of Jesus of Nazareth,—of Him who seems to say in all his *dicta*, *precepts*, and *parables*, that a being at enmity with God—that a spirit hostile to man—that an agent of evil—has, by a mysterious dispensation of Providence, been allowed to make such a distribution of the riches of the world as would suit his malignant and destructive projects. And we attempted to prove, by arguments derived from the history, the precepts, the parables, and the positive declarations of our Lord, not only that riches are the very *res infecta* of our poor polluted systems—the *bane* to Christianity—the lure of Satan; but that the opinions—the false opinions—which obtain upon this subject, present the most formidable obstacle against the advancement of that DISPENSATION, which is in the course of time (ere long, perhaps) to supersede every dispensation devised by the wisdom of men;—we mean the DISPENSATION OF REDEMPTION prepared by the Son of God.

That the words of the Lord Bishop of London, above quoted, do admit of an acceptation, or reading, strictly true in the abstract, is most freely admitted. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof;" all creation is the work of his hands; he reigneth supreme over all things; "the gold is mine, and the silver is mine,

---

respectfully submitted to the Lord Bishop of London, suggested by his Lordship's recent letter to the inhabitants of London and Westminster. By Christianus.' London, Richardson, 1830.

saith the Lord of Hosts;" "HE lifteth up one, and putteth down another;" "HE maketh rich, and He maketh poor;" "riches, and wealth, and honour, are given" by HIM.

To this abstract proposition none but an atheist would demur; to this fundamental, yet inscrutable truth, even every deist is ready to subscribe. But is this the sense in which the Lord Bishop employs these words? Does not this authorized and distinguished teacher intend to inculcate that the distribution of wealth, which now obtains in the world, *is the Lord's doing?*—that every rich man may look upon his worldly wealth as *a Heaven-sent gift?*

The question, then, on which we have joined issue with the Bishop, is all-absorbing and most momentous. There is happily, however, no room here for quibbling upon words, or for dissembling about facts. Both parties are agreed in all the main particulars of the case. Thus, that there is an Almighty Being, the creator and preserver of this globe and all which it inhabits, the author and giver of all good, is our first position; and that there is another being, of an opposite character, who is the author and fomentor of all evil; this is the second of the primary positions in which both parties are agreed. Then, again, that our world abounds with wealth, and that this wealth is so divided that some are rich and some are poor; this proposition is assented to by all, and constitutes the premises whereon the disputed hypothesis takes its stand. The question simply is—which

of these two antagonistic beings has now got the wealth of the world at his disposal?

Our inquiry then must be, not how the matter of fact has heretofore stood—not what has been the commonly received opinion upon the subject, but what the truth is, as connected with Christianity—what response does the revelation of Jesus give to the question? What is worldly wealth to the Christian citizen? Is it a boon or a bane? Receives he it, keeps he it, disposes he of it, to his welfare or his injury? Does the Lord of the Christian Dispensation bestow upon his people the wealth of the world for their dowry? Does he advise them to take care of it if they have it? Or does he denounce the possession of it as the bribe of his antagonist?

Christian reader, confident we are, if thou hast a heavy purse, and much goods laid up for many years, that our question so proposed will be an offence in thy sight. Thou wilt be ready to spurn it from thee, and cry out,—"What will this mischievous babbler say next?" But, on the other hand, speak we to one who hath not riches, and desireth them not; to one who is content with the simplicity which is in Christ?—then let him go hand in hand with us to the foot of the cross, to the Gospel of the Redeemer, and, by the light emanating from such a source, say whether the Lord Bishop, with the testimony of all the influential world on his side, or the conclusion which these illiterate pages would

unfold, be the truth—evangelical truth. This is the question to which, in this treatise, we reply.

Let it be observed, then, precisely what that error of doctrine is—what that fallacy in divinity is—which we venture to impute to our dignified prelate. We do not say that our prelate is the apologist of sordid, selfish, miserly men. We do not say that avarice, or evil concupiscence, or covetousness, is the besetting sin of that church establishment over which he presides. We do not say that the church does not preach and propagate the Gospel of the Redeemer;—but, mark it well, we do allege, plainly and boldly, that our Lord Bishop, with all those who teach and preach as he does, are practically in league with *the antagonist of the Christian dispensation;* and this plain, bold, and momentous allegation, and no other, we challenge our opponents to meet and to refute.

Let it not be supposed that our Lord Bishop has either time or disposition to attend to such a libel as this; but amongst the many choice spirits and highly talented men who respectfully attend the episcopal palace, we conjecture that there may and must be some, who may think our cogitations worthy of examination and reply.

The great question for us to decide, then, in this controversy is—

Who, what, and where, is the ANTAGONIST *of the*

Christian Dispensation—the antagonist with whom we have asserted that the Lord Bishop, and those who teach and preach with him, are in league? In other words—*who, what, and where, is* ANTICHRIST?

There needs, then, Christian reader, but one word more to put you into full possession of the truth, which it is the object of this essay to develop. That word is MAMMON. *Mammon*, we submit, is *Antichrist*. The following observations are all devoted to the illustration of this simple apophthegm—

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

Let it at once be understood what we mean by Mammon. We refer, by this phrase, to the Belial, or Moloch, or Apollyon, of our age; the type and form which Satan, that old serpent, is allowed now to assume—"the mystery of iniquity," which in the latter days is to be revealed to mankind.

This is the truth, the great truth, which it is our anxious desire to present to the reader. A greater truth the Christian cannot utter. His mind may muse on higher topics; his soul may be enwrapt in pious, or even elevated to seraphic aspirations; but a more important, a more practical subject, cannot be propounded to his contemplation.

There are not in the Bible, nor in all the vocabularies of all language, two words of superior import to these, MAMMON—ANTICHRIST. They show how it is

that mankind are still held under a Satanic thraldom; they point out the way in which the world is to be emancipated from its slavery; and they lead the humblest intellect to the contemplation of the period when this emancipation—that is, when the regeneration and redemption of mankind—shall be accomplished.

Such is the character of the essay, Christian reader, now before you. One pervading thought, one object of hope, of desire, of prayer, will be found in every page. With the moody Prince of Denmark, we would—

> ——— Wipe away all trivial fond records,
> All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past,
> That youth and observation copied there;
> And thy commandment all alone shall live
> Within the book and volume of my brain,
> Unmixt with baser matter.

We repeat it, MAMMON—ANTICHRIST; Mammon, the antagonist of the Christian dispensation on the earth. This is the proposition of fact, of truth, which we would, if we had the power, proclaim to all the world—MAMMON, ANTICHRIST.

Such is the nature of that controversy into which we would here presume to enter. We would undertake to advocate the cause of the Christian Dispensation with a world given to antichrist, to idolatry, to mammonism; with a world of principalities, of powers, and rulers of spiritual deceits in high places. We would speak of this Dispensation as containing a science and system purely divine, wholly regenerative, and alto-

gether benign to man; as a Dispensation which the Lord Jehovah has prepared and proffered to our benighted and depraved world, for the express purpose of redeeming and delivering it from that bondage of iniquity into which it has been plunged by the grand adversary of man.

SECTION II.

THE TEST OF TRUTH.

LET it be observed, in the very outset of our arguments and representations, that in such a discussion the only standard of authority to which appeal is to be made, is *the ascertained testimony of Christ.* There is but one right course to be pursued in the investigation of such a question as this. Here both the accuser and the accused are bound to take up and to abide by the same law and the same testimony, the same revelation, and the same authority. THE GOSPEL OF JESUS OF NAZARETH—the New Testament—the New Covenant—does it speak plainly, intelligibly, directly, conclusively, to the point? If it does, then all Christian controversy must necessarily cease. That man is a Christian in disguise, who prefers the sophistries of the schools, or the maxims of the world, to the plainly recorded word of Jesus of Nazareth.

"The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." The testimony of Jesus of Nazareth, the divine mediator of the new covenant between an offended God and his rebellious creatures, is, ALL TRUTH—IS THE truth, be the subject of its announcement what it may. "THE

TRUTH shall make you free," said the Lord, our deliverer.

Here we deprecate all human authority, and place our question on the gospel of the Christian dispensation alone, well assured that a plain and luminous answer will be afforded to it. If our premises be true in fact, true in spirit, true in principle, true in practice and operation, when tested by the gospel of Jesus, the most exalted and dignified of the earth must give credence to our proposition, must humble himself before its mighty and distinctive import, although it were uttered by the most contemptible of mankind. The moment we show that our data are plainly predicated in the Bible, there must be an end of all controversy among Christians.

We are then to "cease from man, whese breath is in his nostrils," and "turn ourselves unto the Lord," to that Lord whose name we bear, and whose laws we are to obey. As common folk, indeed, our opponents tell us, that we ought to resort to the church for the solution of our question. "Spiritual deliberations," we are informed by one of them, "belong alone to the man of God, and may not be interfered with by the laity."* Upon this principle, we, as laymen, are lawless trespassers on other men's premises. We invade the province of our betters; and, instead of presuming to write an essay on so sacred and momentous a subject, we ought

* Gordon of Oxford.

to be pious readers, attentive listeners, and humble compliants, in all that our spiritual pastors and masters are kind enough to teach us. But alas! be it for weal or for woe, we cannot help it, our truant minds will not yield to any such admonition. It is after the most serious, oft repeated, and, we trust, dispassionate consideration, that we venture on this controversy. If it be to churchmen that we must resign our judgment, we cannot avoid asking to which of the two great churches of Christendom are we to go; to the church of Rome, or the church of England? We have consulted both, but to no one good and salutary result. We find, and we shall again have to advert to the fact, that each of these churches fixes upon the other the stigma of personating the covert being whom we seek. And, much more than that, we find them in thorough subservience to, and in ample amity with, the creature they affect to denounce and despise.

This assertion will have a very strange aspect in the eye of an ordinary reader; we cannot, however, either retract or qualify it. We believe, in the first place, that the libel is true; in the next, that the development of the truth is of the highest importance to the best interests of all mankind: and lastly, that it is competent to every sound and common-sense Christian to make the truth appear. Again, then, we say, "Cease from man, turn unto the Lord."

But how are we, in the right way, to turn to the Lord? Shall we attempt to search into the depths of

that sacred volume wherein the Almighty, for thousands of years, has recorded his holy will and word? Or shall we supplicate that some divine ray of heavenly inspiration may be shed upon us? Nothing of the kind. Not only do we regard any such attempt on our parts as entirely vain; not only have we no faith in any such heaven-sent inspiration now-a-days; but a more available source of light, another channel of communication as to truth, is always open before us. The brief, the brilliant, the comprehensive, the conclusive GOSPEL of the Lord of the Christian Dispensation, this contains all the intelligence we require. The question before us, in whatever form, or shape or type, it may arise, must be submitted to this ordeal—"IT IS WRITTEN," WE MUST READ, and what we read we must receive and submit to.

This, then, is our principle, that all human authority—all tradition—must succumb and yield to the wrritten—to the revealed—will and word of the holy gospels; that to it must all the articles, and dogmas, and expositions of all churches, and all states, and all individuals too, be made to bend. One of the great luminaries of our day, before he became entangled in the meshes of the State religion, has placed this position in better language than we know how to use. He says —yes, says—for no retractation is admissible in such a case:—"Had no message come to us from the fountain head of truth, it were natural enough for every individual mind to betake itself to its own speculation. But a message *has* come to us bearing on its forehead every character of authenticity: and is it right now that the

question of our faith, or of our duty, should be committed to the capricious visitations of this man's taste or that man's fancy? *Our* maxim and our sentiment is, God has put an authoritative stop to all this. He has spoken; and the right or the liberty of speculation no longer remains to us. The question now is not, 'What thinkest thou?' In the days of pagan antiquity, no other question could be put; and to the wretched delusions and idolatries of that period, let us see what kind of answer the human mind is capable of making, when left to its own guidance, and its own authority. But we call ourselves Christians, and profess to receive the Bible as the directory of our faith; and the only question in which we are concerned is, 'What is written in the law;—how readest thou?'"

"The Bible"—we quote the same celebrated and once unsophisticated advocate for the written word—"will allow of no compromise. It professes to be the directory of our faith, and claims a total ascendancy over the souls and the understandings of men. It will enter into no composition with us, or our natural principles. It challenges the whole mind as its due, and it appeals to the truth of heaven for the high authority of its sanctions. 'Whosoever addeth to, or taketh from, the words of this book, is accursed,' is the absolute language in which it delivers itself. This brings us to its terms. There is no way of escaping after this. We must bring every thought into the captivity of its obedience.*

* Dr Chalmers' Evidences, Works, vol. IV, pp. 434, 435. 440.

However the reverend teacher may have discovered some necessity or political expediency to induce him now and then to yield to the Mammonian influence in the church, these are admirable sentiments, and are amply sufficient to confirm our great principle, that in this controversy

THE TESTIMONY OF THE GOSPEL IS ALL IN ALL.

SECTION III.

THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

You will find, Christian reader, that the difference which subsists between us and our opponents here, is to be found in the fact, that they treat Christianity as a *Religion*, and a great mystery, and we speak of it as a *Dispensation*. To remove everything like ambiguity and complexity from these terms, let it be observed, that the word, *Dispensation*, we employ as conveying the idea of a particular system; a distinct order of things; having its own elementary principles, its own peculiar laws, nature, direction, and destiny. By the term *Christian* dispensation, we mean that system, or order of things, which the Son of God, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, proffered and propounded to the human race; the elementary principles, properties, and laws of which are to be found in the writings of the Evangelists.

Let it be further stated, that the elements, principles, and laws of the Christian dispensation, are not only, *sui generis*, all divine; they are not only anomalous to the elements, principles, and laws of the world in which we live; but they go further; they are practically, radically, and essentially, *regenerating*, *redeeming*, *correc-*

tive; and *they refer to time, as well as to eternity.* As the good physician applies himself to the diseased body, so the Physician of souls offers his Dispensation, as remedial to a distempered world.

How the world became degenerated and depraved? Why the Lord God Almighty has not been pleased to cleanse it with a breath?—are queries into which we presume not to enter. The *fact* of our fallen state as human beings, and the *fact* of a scheme of deliverance being wrought out for us, as human beings, by the Lord Jesus Christ,—these are the grounds upon which we take our stand.

It is of the utmost importance to remember, that the Christian Dispensation is offered to mankind, and to every man, in his twofold capacity:—first, as a being for time, and afterwards as a creature destined to live throughout all eternity; and, furthermore, that the laws, the precepts, the practical principles of this Dispensation, must be for the government of mankind, and every man, in *time.*

Our spiritual masters and pastors generally wrap themselves up in their mysteries—they overlook this momentous distinction—and so speculate, spiritualize, and sublimate the whole economy of the Christian Dispensation for time, as to make it barren of good works, and useless as a compendium of righteous morality. This they do, because, under the cloak thus produced, they can indulge their cupidity, their covetousness, their

attachment to the things of Mammon. They are willing to forget how utterly irreconcilable are the services of God and Mammon, and resist the force of the evangelical declaration, that "the friendship of this world is enmity with God."

Keeping this important distinction always in mind, we shall easily see how it is, that the most distinguished Christians of our day contrive to accomplish the alleged impossibility of serving both God and Mammon at one and the same time. They serve, or affect to serve, God as religionists, or as spiritualized persons, for all purposes that have respect to heaven and to a future state. But as worldlings, and creatures of time and sense, how can they help themselves? They must go with the tide, the current, the stream, on which they float; and being consecrated conservatives of the system—that is, the system, as we shall soon see, which has Mammon for its deity—how can they venture on resistance to its laws? Oh! the truth is plain enough, fellow Christian,—but where the remedy for such a mongrel, adulterous, and complicated state of things is, is not so plain. Never mind! The Lord of the Christian Dispensation is in his holy place; he sitteth between the cherubim and seraphim.

Christianity is said to be the *Religion* of the people. Now let us turn to our Bibles to ascertain the full meaning of this word, *Religion.*

The word *Religion* does not occur once in the Old

Testament; in the New it occurs five times. The Apostle Paul, in his address to Agrippa, of the period when he was a persecutor of the Christians, says,—"After the straitest sect of our religion, I lived a Pharisee." And then, after his conversion, he writes thus to the Galatians,—"Ye have heard of my conversation after the Jews' religion, how that, beyond measure, I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it, and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation."

After Paul, the Apostle James—the *radical* Apostle James—when urging the professors of the faith of his day to be doers of the word, and not hearers only, adds, "If any man seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain. Pure religion, and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

Now, it is worthy of remark, that the word used by the Apostle in his address to Agrippa, and rendered by our translators "*Religion*," is eminently of Pagan import and etymology, being derived from the Thracian mysteries instituted by Orpheus; and the term was employed in this particular instance, not in reference to Christianity, but to external and not spiritual Judaism. The word rendered "*Jews' Religion*," in the passage we have quoted from the Epistle to the Galatians, properly means Jewish worship, or Jewish customs, in their carnal acceptation, and not in the spiritual purity of the

Mosaic institution. And the words "*Religion*" and "*Religious*" in the text we have adduced from the Epistle of James, are the representatives of the Pagan word used in the Apostle's address to Agrippa; they are terms of adoption and accommodation, and they ought in translation to have been christianized by the terms "Devout" and "Devotion"—that is, real devotedness of heart to God, resulting from reconciliation with him; to express which the Pagan word, Religion, is entirely inappropriate.

The term was never used by the Apostle Paul in his matchless theological Epistle to the Romans, in his Epistles to the Corinthians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews. And it is further to be observed, that the term was never permitted to escape from the pens of the Apostles Peter and John.

This then is the state of the case with reference to the use of the word *Religion*. The Gospels, like the Old Testament, contain it not; it never once fell from the mouth of the Lord himself; the Evangelists had no occasion to use it; and yet, now-a-days, to the church of our land, and to all our rich spiritualized confederates of Mammon, there is no word in such common use, none so appropriate to their purpose. Our modern Christianity—that is, our modern Christianity, whether viewed as an appurtenance of the state, or as it exists among the sects and parties of the age—has resolved itself into a *Religion*, into a matter of forms and ordi-

nances, or into a matter of spiritual views, speculative opinions, and sanctified habits.

"The Christian's vocabulary" (says the author of 'A Christian's Letters to a Physician') "in the grand and leading features of redemption, has long since been modelled by inspiration; to depart from which, the Apostle Peter esteemed no light matter. And Nehemiah deemed the corruption of the pure language of the Israel of God, by mixing it with that of pagan Ashdod, to be a decisive evidence of the apostacy of the Jews. Shall we, therefore, continue in an Ashdod departure from the lively oracles, by adopting the vague and heathen term *Religion*, to denote the divine plan of salvation identified with CHRISTIANITY? Can we perceive nothing attractive in a word surpassing all others in importance—nothing appropriate in the endearing name of *Christian*—that a preference should be given to an indiscriminate, semi-pagan, and semi-papal definition of the only foundation of our hope—of all that our souls hold dear?"

"But whence the analogy between Christianity and the *Religions* of the earth, that it should succumb to such an epithet? The word "*Religion*" being merely appropriate to the murderous and horrid rites, and the vain oblations of paganism, and all the penances of popery, it obviously pollutes the gospel of Christ and its recipients. The word so clearly applies to the very lowest order of will-worship, carnal ordinances, rites, and ceremonies, and these so infinitely below the rites

and ceremonies of the true Israel of God, that it is never ONCE admitted into the extensive pages of the Old Testament."

"Our translators, having just emerged from popery, so nearly allied to paganism, the word '*Religion*' was by them cherished with filial affection. Hence it is used in writing the *heads* of several chapters in the Old Testament, though incapable of bending the divine Hebrew text in any one instance into such papal and pagan phraseology. In fact, the Hebrew, being a divine language, renders it so directly opposed to paganism, that I do not conceive the Ashdod words 'Religion' and 'Religious,' could, by any fair effort, be translated into Hebrew."

It is of the greatest consequence that a right apprehension of the subject now in hand, that this view of Christianity be retained, contemplating it as a DISPENSATION rather than as a *Religion;* not that we apprehend that the Christian Dispensation has not a religion of its own, nor that it is competent to any human being to form any accurate ideas of the origin or designs of this Dispensation, other than those which he derives from Divine Revelation; but that, in the following treatise, our purpose is to speak of the Christian Dispensation *as a Dispensation*, or system of elements, first principles, and laws (we reiterate our previous phraseology) all *sui generis*, all divine, and, we add, all operative and compulsory on the true Christian. Our precise meaning, in these words "operative" and "compulsory," is this, that

no person, that no society, that no nation, can ever realize the promises, or reap the benefits, of the Christian Dispensation for time, by any other means than by the practical adoption of its tenets; that is to say, by conformity and obedience. The following words of our divine Lord and Master seem to convey the distinct idea which we wish to establish: "If any man will DO his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." And, again, the same idea is fully amplified in the memorable declarations;—"He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY is the only Christianity that will be productive of any real good to mankind as creatures of time.

Our controversy will be most rife with those who consider Christianity as a Religion, rather than a system intended for the "improvement and perfection of human society;" who assert that "human society is never considered in Scripture, or by any Christian church, in any other light than as subsidiary to a future state;" who maintain that "the religion of the gospel is the connexion between this and a future state, and that it is to be considered in this view alone." So that it becomes, in such men's esteem, a fanciful, romantic, visionary, Utopian chimera with which our minds are

inflated, when we speak of the Christian Dispensation as remedial and regenerative for time, as well as presenting redemption for eternity. Again we affirm, that this Dispensation verily has its religion; but to call the Dispensation itself a religion, is to invest the part with the attributes of the whole.

Are we chargeable, as the result of the preceding representations, with underrating religious ordinances, the rites, ceremonies, and sacraments of the church? Let it be clearly understood, that we value them as *means*, not as *ends;* and that while we venerate them as *religious exercises*, we regard them as no succedaneum for the *Dispensation* itself. Our doctrine in this particular is, that "to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

SECTION IV.

MAMMON — ANTICHRIST.

THE EVANGELICAL ARGUMENT.

THE following is our hostile problem or hypothesis:—We believe that MAMMON, the god of wealth, the spirit or genius of that wealth which is the key to all those worldly advantages which the Bishop of London appreciates so highly, is ANTICHRIST—is the very arch ANTAGONIST of the Christian Dispensation now on the earth—that this is his character, his office, province, practice, to you, Christian reader, to us, to the state, to the church, to the parliament, to the bar, to the press, to the camp, to the stage, to all the civilized circles of the world, to our age, times, and nation.

We shall dissect this momentous problem, and see whether we cannot sustain and establish it upon a testimony, an evidence, which no rational man, or enlightened Christian, can gainsay with effect.

This hostile apothegm or hypothesis contains the following Five Particulars:—

1. There is such a word incorporated in our English

language as MAMMON; and this word is a noun substantive, singular number, and has respect to person.

2. The proper meaning or signification of the word MAMMON, is god of wealth—the spirit, genius, or demon of worldly riches.

3. There is actually such a person, spirit, genius, demon, or being, as MAMMON, extant and everywhere present in all Christian communities.

4. This person, MAMMON, the god of wealth, is also the god of the world, the master spirit and ruling genius of all our worldly institutions, the prince of the power of the air, inflating and polluting the political atmosphere, which fills the court, the church, the senate, the camp, the city.

5. This person, MAMMON, the god of wealth, the god of the world, is, in an especial, radical, and evangelical sense of the word, ANTICHRIST — the *Antagonist*, the actual, potential, personal, revealed, denounced *Antagonist* of Almighty God under the Christian Dispensation.

THE TWO FIRST POINTS OF OUR APOTHEGM — can give no offence, and therefore may be left to stand alone. We need to give no testimonies in support of these positions, because there is not any honest Lexicon which will not bear us out in the above definitions.

THE THIRD POSITION, that there actually exists such an entity or being as MAMMON, may be disputed.

But the question is decided by the word, the eternal word, of Jesus of Nazareth. Our divine Lord and Master has declared—

"No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. YE CANNOT SERVE GOD AND MAMMON."

The Evangelist tells us that when the Pharisees heard this—the Pharisees, "who were covetous"—they derided the teacher, and despised the testimony. And in order that our evidence may not be shaken by the exposition of any modern Mammonized Christian, we must insist upon it, that this fact—the real existence of such an agent as Mammon—has the word, the immutable and sacred word of the Most High for its basis. It is essential to the wisdom and the integrity of the testimony so given, that *both* these antagonist Masters should have the *same real being*. To suppose that the first is a real existence, and that the latter is a fictitious, unreal creature, is at once to assail the intelligence and truth of the Redeemer's dictum. The testimony to personal existence in the latter case, is equally invincible and decisive with the testimony in the former case. This testimony, we submit, is so clear, so specific, and so conclusive to our point, as to need neither corroboration nor exposition.

Our fourth proposition is,—That this being, MAMMON, the god of wealth, is also the god of the world—the master-spirit and ruling genius of all our worldly institutions, the prince of the power of the air, inflating and polluting the political atmosphere which fills the court, the church, the senate, the camp, the city.

This is a bold saying, no doubt; but how do we show that it is true—literally and practically true? Why, we appeal, in the first place, to common experience and daily observation, drawn from the practice of the world. Who that mixes in the busy scenes of life—who that reflects deeply upon the reports of our every-day transactions — does not see and feel the truth of our apothegm? Wealth is the basis, wealth is the cement, wealth is the prime *materiél* of that which we significantly call our political constitution; wealth is the *Primum Mobile* of human transactions and affairs. What cannot wealth in this world accomplish! How little can be done without it? What respect does wealth receive, even when associated with personal worthlessness and moral corruption? What contempt is cast upon poverty, though it may be connected with every human virtue and excellence? Is not worldly influence almost invariably co-extensive with worldly wealth? Who can exercise influence who is destitute of wealth? Subserviency to wealth is the distinctive characteristic of our world.

The Word of God sets it down axiomatically and plainly, that "Covetousness is Idolatry;" and observa-

tion convinces us that this idolatry is commensurate with the world. And its mighty power controls and directs the very individuals who are often the most disposed to doubt and to deny its existence. It has been very well remarked by one of the most modern Ashdod assailants of Mammon, that the vicious principle in which worldlings indulge, is "so subtle that you cannot lay hold of it, so as to render it tangible. It is so deeply seated, that you cannot draw it from its hiding-place, to make it visible in the face of day. You may convince a man who goes on in a regular course of licentiousness and intemperance of the folly and wickedness of his conduct, by showing him the inevitable miseries to which it leads, even in the present life. But we have no such hold on the covetous. In reply to every argument, he will tell you, that what we call covetousness is only a necessary prudence to augment his estate, and secure it from danger, to provide for the wants of his family, and leave something to his children when he is gone; and that persons of good repute in probity and wisdom, are found prosecuting a similar course."*

Thus Mammon deludes, while it governs; thus Mammon is the deceiver, as well as the despot of the world.

From the evidence of experience and observation, we turn to the opinions of our most enlightened philosophers in political economy.

---

* Christian Beneficence, by Thomas Dick, LL.D., p. 330.

"The science of political economy," says Professor John M'Culloch, "consists in a knowledge of the laws which regulate the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth."

"Mammon," says a greater than he, "is the god of every commercial nation. His power is irresistible;"* a testimony precisely in accordance with the decision of the Holy Scriptures—"Wine maketh merry, but Money answereth all things."

It is a happy thing for us that the great Conservative statesmen of the day speak out; there is happily no reserve, no duplicity about them as to this matter. We hear the illustrious Duke, who conquered the conqueror of all the world besides, from his seat as a legislative peer, declare that he holds the protection of property to be the first great end and object of all legislation. We have heard the right honourable Baronet who leads the Conservative party in the House of Commons, echo forth the same position; and we read from the recent manifesto of one of the most distinguished members of the same party, the self-same sentiment,—"I am for the government by property, against the government by numbers."†

Here we might avail ourselves of the testimony of our opponents, if it were wanting. Why, do not the Lord

* Life of Bishop Watson, ii, 126.

† Speech of the Right Hon. Sir J. Graham, Bart., 1838.

Bishop of London, and all his worldly-advantaged clergy, themselves say that it is folly to suppose it possible that the business of life could be conducted on any other than property principles? Now, although it may be very unseemly for us, pigmies alike in politics and polemics, to carry out such a controversy to its ultimatum with so formidable a body, we will nevertheless accomplish our purpose by quoting the testimony of one who has better means of penetrating the superficies of these things than the Prelate of London and his clergy can have.

The following voice has crossed the Atlantic:*—

"The first reason why we are not to be conformed to the world in business is, that the principle of the world is that of supreme selfishness. This is true universally in the pursuit of business. The whole course of business in the world is governed and regulated by the maxims of supreme and unmixed selfishness. It is regulated without the least regard to the commands of God, or the glory of God, or the welfare of their fellow-men. The maxims of business, generally current among business-men, and the habits and uses of business-men, are all based upon supreme selfishness. Who does not know that in making bargains the business-men of the world consult their own interest, and seek their own benefit, and not the benefit of those they deal with? No; it is always for their own advantage. And are Christians to

* From a city over which it is quite manifest the Gospel shines with purer light, than it does over the metropolis of England.

do so? They are required to act on the very opposite principle to this—'Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth.' They are required to copy the example of Jesus Christ;—did he ever make bargains for his own advantage? And may his followers adopt the principle of the world? If Christians are to do this, is it not the most visionary thing on earth to suppose that the world is ever going to be converted to the gospel? . . . . The whole system only recognises the love of self. Go through all the ranks of business-men, from the man that sells candy on the side-walk at the corner of the street, to the greatest wholesale merchant or importer in the United States, and you will find that one maxim runs through the whole, to buy as cheap as you can, and sell as dear as you can; to look out for 'number one,' and to do always, as far as the rules of common honesty will allow, all that will advance your own interests, let what will become of the interest of others. . . . . To conform to the world in the pursuits of business, is a flat contradiction of the engagements that Christians make when they enter the church. What is the engagement you make when you enter the church? Is it not to renounce the world, and live to God? Is it not to be actuated by the spirit of Jesus Christ? Is it not to possess supreme love to God, and to renounce self, and to give yourself to glorify God, and to do good to men? You profess not to love the world, its honours, or its riches. Around the communion table, with your hand on the broken body of your Saviour, you avouch these to be your principles, and pledge yourself to live by these maxims. And then,

what do you do? You go away, and follow maxims and rules gotten up by men, whose avowed principle is the love of the world, and whose avowed object is to get the world."

To the subject alluded to in the latter part of this quotation, the awful and universal prevalence of Mammonism among professing Christians, we shall subsequently refer at length, and therefore we shall not dwell upon it here. We put it, however, without fear of successful contradiction—MAMMON IS THE RULER OF THE WORLD. It may be a dangerous and mischievous doctrine to propagate; it may be treason to the state, heresy to the church, an offence at home; but it is a truth—a truth which must be developed as the Christian Dispensation enlarges itself on our globe—MAMMON IS, DE FACTO, LORD OF THE ASCENDANT IN OUR EVERY-DAY WORLD, DENY IT WHO MAY!

It is quite true that the presence of the arch-fiend has never become an object of sense; we can neither see, nor smell, nor taste, nor touch him. But his influence is just as manifest as though he were tangible and visible; from the throne to the vilest cellar, his dominion is everywhere palpable and manifest.

OUR FIFTH PROPOSITION is, that Mammon, the god of wealth, the god of the world, is, in an especial, radical, and evangelical sense of the word, Antichrist—the antagonist, the actual, potential, revealed, denounced anta-

gonist of Almighty God, under the Christian Dispensation.

Of all the mysteries by which the faith of the Christian is tried, none is more astounding, more impervious to his sight, than that the Lord Jehovah permits an antagonist in our globe—a potential antagonist—not a solitary enemy in the camp, not a daring rebel here, or a secret traitor there, but the captain of a legion, the leader of a host, invading, polluting, demolishing, trampling upon the finest works of the Creator Lord. In this awful fact, as well as in many other inscrutable dispensations of his moral and providential government, "his path is in the sea, his footsteps are in the deep waters, and his way is not known." "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"

That there is such a being, such a power, everywhere acting on the surface of the globe, is unquestionable; and this being or power may, with the strictest propriety, be called Antichrist—the antagonist of the Christian Dispensation. The question then is,—who, what, and where is this being, this power, whose ascendancy over the world is such as to keep it in a state of voluntary bondage? This is the question to which we now demand the answer of truth.

And whither must we resort to find the answer of the inquiry? If we consult the religious world of our times

and country, the answer we obtain is plain, specific, and positive enough—thousands of volumes having been printed, and published, and highly approved of too, proving, to the satisfaction of their various authors, that the Church of Rome is Antichrist—the Antichrist of the Apocalypse, which is to be utterly annihilated before the Christian Dispensation can flourish on the earth. But if we cross the few miles of sea which separate our Protestant island from the continent of Europe, there we are furnished with an opposite response. The great majority of the religious world in Catholic countries, agree in denouncing the Church of England, as affording the actual personification of the being whom we seek, who stands as an adversary between man and his Redeemer.

In this dilemma, what does it behove the good, sound, common-sense believer to do? To put his trust in both these high and holy authorities, is quite impossible, for they neutralize the one the other. Our suggestion is, in the first place, that he distrust them both; and then that he inquire how far these two great churches of Christendom, England and Rome, are themselves under the dominion of the being we seek. Inquire? Yes —but of whom? If the consecrated interpreters of the truth prophesy falsely — if the high priests and rulers of the people are themselves deluded — are themselves gone over to the enemy of souls — whither shall we, of the common people, resort to find the truth desired?

Facts, it is admitted on all hands, are stubborn things.

Our statement of the fact that both the two great churches of Christendom are given to their idols, that they both truckle and submit themselves to the ascendancy of that being who is the undoubted antagonist of the Christian Dispensation, will, as a matter of course, be stoutly denied; and not only stoutly denied, but vehemently denounced as a wicked and malicious libel.* Let both the assertion and the denial then be fully examined.

It is our destiny to live in times when the most ample scope is given to every humble man to read and to examine for himself; we may not only reason freely upon our every-day experience and common observation, but we may all have that book in our hands which contains the revelation of the *whole truth* of the whole matter; and we may assure ourselves, that whoever sets himself down soberly and honestly to adopt this process of examination, will very soon be fully enlightened as to the particular libel here reiterated.

We are advised, indeed, and from high judicial authority too,† that "it is practice and experience alone that give wisdom." But we know better than to fall in with any such opinion. We have heard of a source of wis-

---

* Let him who seeks the truth on this point peruse the Rev. Sydney Smith's letters to Dean Singleton,—both Church dignitaries.

† The Lord Chief Baron Abinger's counsel to the Squirearchy, the grand jury of Leicestershire, August 1839.

dom, which is not only more available, but more pure, than any which the most extensive sphere of observation, of practice, and experience can possibly give. The judge bids us go and drink of the foul and tainted waters of his own polluted reservoir; we prefer to go to the fountain-head, whence the element of perfect wisdom always flows; firmly believing, that to him who reads aright, immediate inspiration follows.

As Christians, then, let us examine our subject with all the caution possible, deriving our chief light and intelligence from the Gospel of Truth, as uttered by the Lord of the Christian Dispensation himself; and yet always ready to adopt the suggestions of experience, of observation, and practice, whenever in conformity with that Gospel.

It is said of a certain recently deceased diplomatist of the highest celebrity,* that he once declared the best use he could make of words, was to disguise his thoughts. Christian reader, our purpose here is just the opposite of this. We refer you, as we did above in the third point of our case, to the word of the Lord of the Christian Dispensation himself; and by that word to determine whether the proposition now under your eye be a solemn and sacred truth, or the phantasm of a deluded imagination. We believe that we shall soon find an authority for our position, which puts the wrangling testimony of all priests and prelates completely aside.

---

* Prince Talleyrand.

Once more we quote the decisive declaration of our Lord—

"Ye cannot serve GOD and MAMMON."

Our assumption is, that these words necessarily involve, not only the actual existence of each of the two masters, who, it is so premised, seek for suit and service of all mankind, but also that they lay down as a certain truth that antagonistic position of these two masters, for which we contend.

But we submit further, that our great teacher, Jesus of Nazareth, has not only plainly identified and actually named that invisible being who is the antagonist of his Dispensation in our world, but also that he has elucidated and exhibited this great truth in all the varieties of argument of which the case admits. We allude to his Precepts, both prohibitive and prescriptive; to his Parables affecting the rich, with which the pages of the Gospel sufficiently abound; and to the Example which he has set before the world. We beg you, Christian reader, to compare, or rather to contrast, some of these positions of your Lord and Master, with the maxims, the fashion, and the practice of our worldly Mammonian professors.

Take, for instance, this precept—"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal." What are the maxims, what is the practice, of the most wise and prudent of the age we live in? Can

anything be conceived more anomalous or antagonistic?

Take again this precept—"Give to him that asketh thee; and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not away." Or this—"When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours. But thou, when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind."

Observe, Christian reader, the precise question here before you, is not, were such directions as these ever intended for literal interpretation and actual practice, or anything of that sort; but the question is, whether these precepts do not prescribe a practice as diametrically opposed to that which our exalted, wise, and prudent worldly-advantage men adopt, as black and white, light and darkness, Christ and Belial. Do not these precepts prove that the religion of the modern saint is no more good, sound, vital, radical Christianity, than it is Mohammedism, or Judaism, or anything else. Our Lord has laid down the principle—"By their fruits ye shall know them." Apply, then, the test. We see a man careful and prudent in laying up or placing out the property or capital which he has either acquired or saved, or which has devolved upon him from another, upon the most solid, well-understood, and permanent security; and then we see him using all his ingenuity, cunning, and contrivance, in procuring the best interest, or usury, or dividends, as income upon this capi-

tal. Here, then, he is expressly violating the Christian prohibition as to *laying up*. But further, how does he employ the proceeds of his provident investment? Does he give to him that asketh, or is he ready to lend to the borrower? Not he indeed. He knows that such a course of conduct would directly militate against all the views and objects he had in the original investment, and therefore he naturally turns from such proceedings with disdain. Very well; now let us look at the position in which he is placed by such a course of conduct. It is that of a man well to do in the world, of fine independence, of more than competency—but is it the position of a Christian? Here is a prohibition, forbidding—"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth." Here is a Precept, enjoining—"Give to him that asketh," &c. Test, then, the objects of your investigation; they may be professing Christians, pious saints, sound divines—try them, we say, by these available, and to us infallible, criteria. If they abstain from laying up because of the prohibition, if they give away what they have got because of the precept, then we shall not only acknowledge that they are acting as Christians, but we shall be ready to guarantee to them individually every blessing which the Spirit of the Christian Dispensation attaches to faithfulness and obedience. O! it is a most delightful errand to be engaged upon, to tell any brother Christian that he can make no advance in Christian knowledge, or refinement in Christian practice, which will not bring its own reward, its own confirmation and bliss!

But where there is not abstinence from laying up because of the prohibition—where there is not distribution of what is possessed, because of the precept—while we do not say that the disobedient individual worships the idol, that he is mean, and sordid, and avaricious, or that he has no knowledge of Christianity, we do allege, that the defections imputable to him, bring down all his professions, his attainments, his spirituality, his aspirations, his gifts, to the worth of the sounding brass and tinkling cymbal; and that he is wholly devoid of that governing, discriminating principle which marks and constitutes the true Christian—we mean the spirit of that benevolence which led the Christian's Lord to sacrifice everything for the good of others.*

We have adverted, in the process of our argument, to the great principle laid down by our Lord, that Mammon is the arch-antagonist of God in the Christian Dispensation; and we have also adverted to the Spirit of his Precepts, both prohibitory and prescriptive: The testimony of his PARABLES comes next to be considered.

The parable of Dives and Lazarus speaks perhaps in

* The authority on which we venture to pronounce a judgment like this on any fellow-creature, is the Gospel, the word of the Lord himself.—Vide Matth. v, 43, 47; Luke, vi, 34; John, xiii, 34, 35.

If words like these require comment, the sincere Christian will not refuse to advert to the apostles of this divine Teacher.—See Gal. v, 14; Eph. v, 2; 1 Pet. 1, 2; 1 John, ii, 9, 11, iii, 14-20.

the plainest terms, provided we read the authenticated text without the glosses which certain shrewd divines have contrived to throw upon the question.

"There was a certain rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; and there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table. * * * And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom; and the rich man also died, and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said—Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented," &c. &c.

The time has come, Christian reader, for all those glosses and false interpretations to be dissipated, with which covetous and clever men have contrived to obscure this parable, as well as all the other parts of our Lord's instructions, which show the poisonous, malignant nature of worldly wealth. They, the learned expounders, tell us, that *Gluttony** was the sin which

* See the heading of the chapter (Luke xvi) in all our orthodox Bibles.

the Lord of the Christian Dispensation has here so utterly condemned. And they have led millions to suppose, that in the corresponding parable of the unjust steward, our Lord has made himself the apologist of fraud and embezzlement, overlooking the true import of those Gospel elucidations, which put *rich men*, as such, in a position of censure and condemnation. All these things show how subtle and how entire that influence is which Mammon exercises in our world, as the antagonist of the Redeemer's Dispensation.

The parable of the unjust steward affords another striking illustration of the same argument, if required, in all its primitive simplicity and truth. We see the Lord of Righteousness placing in juxta-position a RICH MAN and a dishonest steward, for the sole purpose of *commending* the latter in the character of a *detected culprit;* that is whilst his character and conduct stood in competition with that of the self-sufficient rich man!

The testimony of another parable uttered by our Lord, is equally decisive on the subject. He said—"The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully; and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do; I will pull down my barns, and build greater, and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God

said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then, whose shall those things be which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God." If this memorable parable be read and considered in the light cast upon it by the principles and representations we have adduced, it will be found quite conclusive for our purpose.

The illustrations which our Lord has given in his parables of the truth for which we are contending, are strongly confirmed by *two striking incidents* recorded in his history.

The first incident is THE TEMPTATION to which He was exposed before he entered upon the great work of human redemption. It is recorded by the sacred penman, that the Devil, invested with miraculous power, made a complete display of the riches of the world to the view of the Redeemer, and made a proffer of them all in these explicit terms, "All this power will I give unto thee, and the glory; for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it; if thou, therefore, wilt worship me, all shall be thine."

Is it not manifest from these words, that the *Evil One* has had the riches of the world committed to him, that there was a time when he could do as he pleased with them, and that his purpose was to employ them to man's destruction? The supposition, that the Almighty has resumed his sovereignty in the case, is not supported by

any warrant of Scripture; but, on the contrary, it appears that all the testimony, both of inspiration and experience, might be adduced in favour of the opposite conclusion.

The second incident to which we allude, is that related by the Evangelists, of the rich man who came running to the Redeemer, and kneeling before him, asked what he could do to secure his title to the inheritance of eternal happiness. We read that this young man could, with truth, plead the virtue of a good moral and religious life; for it is written, that the Redeemer, upon a complete review of his past conduct, "beholding him, loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest; go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor; and thou shalt have treasure in heaven;"—and the sequel was, that this good and virtuous man "was *sad* at that saying, and went away grieved; *for he had great possessions.*"

We now pass on to a fourth head of argument on this all-important subject, and proceed to contemplate THE EXAMPLE which the Lord of the Christian Dispensation has himself given to our world, as the only model or pattern of perfection for human character and conduct, in all its bearings; observing, as we go along, that one of that Lord and Master's divine precepts is, that we should, in all things, and before all things, endeavour to walk in his holy steps.

His command was, "I have given you AN EXAMPLE,

that ye should do as I have done to you." The apostle Peter tells us, that "He left us an example, that we should follow his steps." And John declares, "He that saith he abideth in HIM, ought himself also so to walk, even as HE walked."

Now, let the reader accompany us, while we attentively consider the leading characteristics and more prominent features of this model—OUR EXAMPLE; in order that we may fairly and justly compare or contrast them with the leading characteristics and more prominent features of those who think themselves blessed by heaven, by reason of the large proportion of worldly advantages they possess. The Scriptures, both prophetical and historical, tell us, in terms which now defy all controversy or contradiction, that our Example was—

"A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief;" that "he was despised and rejected of men;" that, while all the riches of all worlds were at his command, he chose a poor estate, a low degree, a debased condition, an humble position among men; that while the "foxes had their holes, and the birds of the air their nests, the Son of Man had not where to lay his head;" that "he came not to be ministered unto, but to minister;" that he was "the carpenter's son;" that he was born in a manger, his mother being no guest for an inn in busy times; that "though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor;" that though he was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God,

he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant."

Here, Christian reader, you have a portraiture before you; you know whence all its lineaments, all its colouring, are taken. What can you say, when you place beside it the example of any of our worldly-advantage-loving Christians? Is it ungracious, unjust, or defamatory to say, all is contrast, all is opposition, all is antagonistic?

What is the practical result which ought to be derived from the example of our Lord, but this—that as he laid aside his divine riches, and descended to a state of poverty, that he might accomplish the momentous design of redemption, so ought his followers, regarding riches, according to his own declarations, as obstructive to the spirit and character of his Dispensation, to refrain from amassing them for personal advantage, and to be prepared to abandon what the world esteems "good and great," for the glory of their Master, the benefit of their fellow-creatures, and the welfare of their souls?

Christ, by his example, repudiated riches—what do his professing followers? What is the conduct which our most distinguished divines and saints exhibit? What do we find?—conformity and agreement? The reply to these inquiries is given by the splendid equipage, the noble palace, the sumptuous board, the dignity, elegance, ease, and luxury of our right honour-

able and right reverend prelates. Is this all? No! the reply is given also by the Mammon hunting, Mammon idolatry, and Mammon slavery, which are universally discoverable among priests and people, preachers, deacons, members, hearers, professors, throughout the whole extent of what is called the religious world. The plain indisputable fact is, that the conduct of nominal Christians absolutely gives THE FALSEHOOD DIRECT to the instructions and example of our Lord.

They say, indeed, that the example of Christ is inimitable! and with truth they say so, if *perfection* be the idea. But our showing is, that the conduct of Christians, and the example of Jesus, differ *in limine*, and in kind, as well as degree. It is the honour of Mammon, and not the honour of Christ, which is sought; it is the authority of Mammon, and not the authority of Christ, which is obeyed.

O this pliant, accommodating disposition of Christians to the world! Is it not *radical* APOSTACY with a fair name? And no marvel; "for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light."

We are fully aware, indeed, that there is one sad subterfuge by which our opponents would fain get rid of our apothegm—they say, "It is polemical, it is controversial —that it involves abstruse points on which there always has been, and always must be, contrariety of opinion."

How shall we expose this evasion to any candid and

unprejudiced reader? We can only rehearse such of our facts as are out of the reach of opposition.

Was there, more than eighteen hundred years ago, such a person as Jesus Christ?

Are the sayings and doings of that person fairly and truly recorded in the gospels attributed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John?

Among these sayings and doings, do we find this, that there are two masters seeking suit and service of all men, as occupants of the world we live in—God and Mammon?

Do we find that the *precepts* of Jesus Christ, such as have respect to wealth, require that his followers should give that wealth away—require that they should not lay up treasure upon earth?

Do we find that the *parables* of Jesus Christ, such as have respect to wealth, put rich men, as such, in a state of utter condemnation?

Do we find that the *example* of Jesus Christ set before the world as the only model of human perfection, in respect of moral worth, would, if imitated, dispossess every rich man of his wealth?

Is not the great *fundamental principle* of Christianity brotherly love—self-sacrifice?—and would not this prin-

ciple, if it were carried out into action, lead precisely to the same results as the precepts, the parables, and the example of our Lord lead to?

Now where is the polemical paradox—where the controversial subtlety in our apothegm—Mammon—Antichrist?

There may be points in the *religion* of the Christian Dispensation full of mystery, which may admit of continuous controversy and endless debate; but Christian *morals*, by which we mean the laws which are to govern mankind in their conduct to each other, cannot be so obscurated and misunderstood. Away, then, with this frivolous objection!

Thus, in the preceding pages, we have displayed to us four distinct rays of light, all emanating from the Sun of Righteousness, and shining upon our short and simple apothegm, MAMMON—ANTICHRIST. They are emitted from Jesus the Messiah, the source of all intelligence and light, the centre of all truth and righteousness, as respects his own Dispensation.

"THUS SAITH THE LORD," touching the person, the province, and the position of that god of this world, who is, in the most emphatic sense, the antagonist of his own Dispensation—"THUS SAITH THE LORD," by his declarations plainly uttered; by his counsel oft repeated; by his precepts, both of prohibition and prescription; by his parables, as lucid as they are point-blank to the

subject; and, above all, by his own bright and prominent example—that example which constitutes the only model of perfection for human conduct—in these various ways, *thus saith the Lord*, MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

Even supposing that we admit for the moment that the precepts, and parables, and judgments of the Redeemer, relative to worldly possessions, are involved in enigma, covered with mystery, and confused in hyperbole, what will the Mammonian Christian say to the history of the Acts of the Apostles? Is this all metaphor and ambiguity too?

Here we find a detailed account of the elementary principles and best practices of the first Christian community. The history is as brief as it is complete and brilliant. We see how the Society was constituted, we see how it prospered, and we see how it was disturbed in its harmony and peace. After the Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Ghost, we are informed that "All that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need." Was not this an example of literal obedience to the command of Christ?

The history further goes on to state that Peter and John went up to the temple at the appointed hour of prayer, and when a certain maimed mendicant asked alms of them by the way, they took occasion to touch on

our Mammonian question: "And Peter, fastening his eyes upon him with John, said, Look on us. And he gave heed unto them, expecting to receive something of them. Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have I give thee: in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk. And he took him by the right hand and lifted him up, and immediately his feet and ancle bones received strength." This miracle, as might have been expected, excited great commotion among the people, and was followed by the addition of vast numbers to the church. And then we are informed —O what a lovely state of things it was! How different to the spirit and the conduct of professing Christians at the present day!—"The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul; *neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own;* but they had all things common. And with great power gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all. Neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the Apostles' feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need."

And by what agency was this delightful state of concord and prosperity in the first instance disturbed? It was by the accursed interposition and influence of Mammon. We read of a pair, Ananias and Sapphira, who entered into that community, that society, that

church, which constituted all that was then visible on the earth of the Christian Dispensation. But they would not comply with the terms upon which alone they could become worthy members of such a community; that is to say, that they should relinquish entirely all the pleasures and all the power that riches could command, and that they should devote their property to the common welfare of the church. They thought, just as every modern Mammonist thinks, that they knew how to manage these matters better than the founders of this new church could know; and therefore they threw in only a part of their possessions to the common stock, and kept back the remainder, thinking probably that it might be required for their children or their heirs. What was the result? Did the first Apostles teach the doctrine which is now held forth by the men who arrogate the character of their representatives and successors? Did Peter say that the Lord spake hastily when he said (and to this express declaration we shall almost immediately refer) that no man of wealth could be a worthy member of his Dispensation? No: the falsehood which Mammon, as the father of lies, prompted Ananias and Sapphira to tell, was punished by their immediate death, and the principle upon which they acted received the strongest possible brand of apostolical rebuke and indignation.

Compare these descriptive records of the conduct, the self-denial, the happiness of the primitive believers, with the prevailing spirit, and deportment, and actions

of professing Christians now. How deplorable, how fearful, is the contrast! What has effected the melancholy change—the sad, the universal deterioration? —What?

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

SECTION V.

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

THE ARGUMENT PURSUED.

We proceed to consider some further arguments and representations which contribute to render our position impregnable—Mammon, Antichrist.

I.

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

The subjects of Mammon cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven—*the Dispensation of Christ.*

In the beginning, when the Son of the Everlasting Father came down from heaven to accomplish the great work of human redemption, we read, that in those days "the poor had the Gospel preached unto them" in intelligible and acceptable terms; that in those days "the common people heard him gladly;" that then the rich—the wisest and the best of them—turned away, some in anger and some in sorrow, from the light and from the requisitions of the

Gospel. It was then said, in words which defy all sophistry, equivocation, or cunning, to be "impossible for any rich man"—any man resolutely rich—"to enter into," or to understand, the nature, the elements, the spirit of the Gospel Dispensation. Can words be more clear, more positive, more comprehensive, more conclusive, than the following? Consider they are not the words of man's wisdom, but the Redeemer's own thoughts and sayings: "Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, that a rich man" (he that had great possessions) "shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven." And again, "I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God." (Matt. xix, 23, 24.) Thousands of attempts have been made to corrupt and to sophisticate this word, some by feigned friends and some by open foes, but all in vain. So long as that declaration remains, bearing upon itself the impress of divine authority, so long must the truth upon which we have insisted remain incontrovertible by the hostility and the inveteracy of man.

"The friendship of this world is enmity against God." All those men who bask in the sunshine of worldly prosperity, must live in darkness as to the merits and virtues of the Redeemer's Dispensation. Every rich professor of the Christian faith will be prone to set this down as calumny and defamation; and why? because he is infatuated by the sorcery of Mammon. In vain the apostle James says, "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries which shall come upon you,

Your riches are corrupted; your garments are moth-eaten; your gold and your silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days." No! though truth shines forth in every line, it is all darkness to the man of worldly wealth. In vain, also, the Lord of that Dispensation which our modern Christians affect to pray for —to pray for, aye, before they ask their daily bread—aye, as the first and the highest boon that their Father in heaven can grant—in vain has the Redeemer technically and emphatically declared in the words we have just quoted, that no man of wealth can come under his Dispensation—that is, while he holds to the determination to keep his wealth in safe places, and thereby to remain subservient to the despotism of Mammon. Christian reader, are we here venting unfounded slanders, or repeat we the truth as it is in Christ? We speak as unto wise men; judge ye! If no man CAN be "the friend of the world," without being at the same time "the enemy of God"—if no servant of Mammon CAN enter into, can understand, or enjoy, the Dispensation of the Son of God—are we not once more justified for insisting with all possible confidence and energy upon our oft-repeated apothegm—MAMMON, ANTICHRIST.

II.

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

To Mammonism, to his authority and influence, ARE TO BE ASCRIBED THE MOST SCANDALOUS OF THOSE

DIVISIONS AND ANIMOSITIES, THE MOST MONSTROUS OF THOSE USURPATIONS AND ERRORS, WHICH HAVE DISTRACTED AND DISGRACED WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED THE CHRISTIAN WORLD. Had Mammon never aroused the pride, the presumption, the evil passions, the grasping cupidity, the overbearing arrogance of those who have borne the name of Christ, the pages of what is termed the history of the Church, would not have been defiled by the description of atrocious crime and cruel persecution, nor would they have been so fearfully stained with human blood. Christian reader, turn to ecclesiastical annals, and say, if the proud prelates; the papal tyrants; the usurping priests; the sordid heresiarchs; the ecclesiastics interfering with political affairs on the one hand, and the politicians interfering with ecclesiastical affairs on the other; the oppressors of human consciences; the pests both of the church and the world—if all these men have not been instigated by Mammon's demon power, if they have not exhibited the badges of Mammon's degrading slavery. To Mammon, the apostle Peter directly ascribes the existence of these scandalous offences, these personifications of evil. He says—"There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken against. And THROUGH COVETOUSNESS *shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you.* THERE is the origin, THERE the prolific source of the enormities and crimes which have been

perpetrated under the prostituted name of religion. Had those who have called themselves Christians, in every age practically espoused the Redeemer's principle —"Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;"—had they sincerely obeyed his *precepts*—had they imbibed the spirit of his *instructions*—had they imitated the tenor of his *example*—the scandalous offences to which we have alluded would never have excited the triumph of his adversaries, and tarnished the honour of his name. Further—

III.

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

MAMMONISM IS INFIDELITY. By *Infidelity* we do not here mean *Scepticism*, but *Unfaithfulness*. Infidelity, as scepticism, is no longer the bane of the church—it is no longer that vice against which the accredited ministers of the Gospel have to raise their strong remonstrance. It is now vulgar and low amongst us, not to profess a belief in the divine origin, attributes, and energies of the Christian Dispensation: no man, making any pretensions either to intellectual endowment or literary attainments, will confess his want of faith.

But take, Christian reader, the following view of the subject. To the preceptive declarations of our Lord, *implicit*, we say IMPLICIT, obedience must be afforded. And really, when we refer to the impious manner in which these precepts have been explained away to please the interested feelings and to support the worldly prejudices of men who call themselves Christians, we are disposed to submit to the common reader, whether

the worst form in which infidelity or faithlessness can appear is not the religious form; whether the exalted and the dignified—the professing, preaching, praying, sanctimonious Mammonists, are not, upon the acknowledged principle that a man's worst foes are those of his own household, the most formidable enemies of the Christian cause.

The Bible, you say, brings a man to God; the creature to his Creator. Just so, we say, the Gospel brings the man to Christ, the Christian to his Redeemer. Our radical question then follows, When the man, the Christian, is brought to Christ his Redeemer, what is he to do? We do not now ask what is he to believe?—we do not now ask what effect will his present gospel call have upon his future immortal condition?—no, but this, what is he to do as a Christian man? Is he at liberty to take so much of his new Master's spirit and laws, of his principles, precepts, and example, as will accommodate itself to his unregenerate state? Is he at liberty so to spiritualize and sublimate the plainest and most positive directions, as that he may follow the maxims, customs, and fashions of that lapsed and degenerate world from which his mind is now emancipated? In other words, can he hold too closely to his new Master's holy and benevolent precepts? Can he deduce too much effulgence from the evangelical parables? Can he imitate too minutely the great model of human perfection which the gospel sets before him? Impossible!

The Gospels abound in testimony more than suffi-

cient to establish this point. It is the servant who knew his Lord's will and did it not, who shall have the beating of many stripes. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them;"—miserable, by consequence, are ye if ye do them not.—Mark! "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings." "Ye are my friends, if ye do WHATSOEVER I command you."

Is it not marvellous, then, that any intelligent person, who has been trained and practised from his youth to manhood in the reading and preaching of these words, should yet contend that *implicit obedience* is not either demanded or practicable? Say we not well, that Mammon is a SORCERER?

"What think ye? A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go to work today in my vineyard. He answered and said, I will not; but afterwards he repented and went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered, I go, Sir, and went not. Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."

The principle of this parable is precisely applicable to the case before us, and the reproof administered by our Lord to the Jews is equally merited by the reli-

gious of our age. They profess to do their Master's will, but they do it not. Now we assert, that when Our Lord says to one of his followers—"Do this," he means that he should do it. When he says to another—"Go," he means that he should go. Already we have convicted the "professors" of our day, by the clearest evidence, of systematic disobedience to the command—the plain, intelligible command—of the Head of the Church. They attempt to reduce Christianity to a subserviency to the customs, the maxims, and the policy of the world: consequently, if the plain truth be told, they are not believers; their faith is not entitled to the name; it is *infidelity*, we again affirm, in its most subtle and pernicious form. What would one of these distinguished saints say to any one of his own servants, clerks, or other adherents, who should act in the same way towards himself? He has given his instructions as instructions should be given, in plain, positive, and simple terms; but the servant, listening to the suggestion of some slimy, subtle spirit that coils about his heart, says to himself—"Did my master really mean what he said?* Is it reasonable to suppose that he expects me to do so unnatural a thing?" Would our saint call this faithful service? Would he tolerate such flagrant disobedience? Let him apply the case to himself. The very *principle* of his conduct is disobedience to Christ;—is he then—can he be a Christian? The monstrous supposition cannot for an instant be entertained.

---

* See Genesis, iii, 1.

The apostle Paul unfolds the truth before alluded to—"Covetousness is Idolatry." So saith the ancient Scripture: "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry." "Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee."

Non-obedience, then, makes the infidel, or the non-Christian; but it is attachment to wealth, and all its concomitants—it is covetousness, however imposing the modification in which it may appear—that constitutes the adversary of the Gospel Dispensation. This is the direful truth:—Mammon has set up one code of laws, Christ another.

WHOM SERVE YE? This is the plain, the settling, the searching question. Do we lay up our money in strongholds and at good usury, or do we give it away? The answer to this plain question determines whose servants we are,—whether we belong to God and to Jesus Christ, or to Mammon and a sordid world.

Behold, then, Mammon as the instigator and power of Infidel Faithlessness!—that is—MAMMON, ANTICHRIST.

IV.

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

IT IS THE AGENCY WHICH, AT THE PRESENT HOUR, MOST EFFECTUALLY IMPEDES THE PROGRESS OF THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION IN OUR WORLD. What is it

which now damps the spirit, which now obstructs the advance, which now prevents the predominance of the Christian Dispensation amongst mankind? It is this: that the most orthodox of the divines of our age concur with the most spiritual of the saints of our day, and preach up a baneful succedaneum to the Gospel, and insist upon submission to institutions that are diametrically opposed to the Christian Dispensation. It is this: that they are the servants of this Antagonist, which still holds his ascendancy in our world—of Mammon, of Antichrist. Their conviction no doubt is, that they are living under the influences and fundamental principles of the Redeemer's Dispensation. The record of this page is, that another master has bought them; that the Antagonist of the Christian Dispensation has taken them in his toils, and that to him, in fact, they are paying suit and service.

Let it be clearly understood to whom we refer when we speak of *Divines* and *Saints*. By DIVINES, we mean all those reverend and learned men, grand compounders, great and little sophists, junior and senior wranglers, with all the hosts of right reverends, very reverends, most reverends, doctors, deans, arch prelates, and arch everything; in fact, all who have gradually adopted their views of the Christian Dispensation as their Alma Mater has taught them—whether that Alma Mater appears in the guise of a National University, or a Dissenting College. And by the term SAINTS, we do not mean to speak either of hypocrites or pretenders, but of persons as sincere and zealously affected in the

Christian cause as any other folk. The Gospels afford the most striking illustrations of the character of the modern Saints. We read of those who "thank God that they are not as other men are;" and of those who "call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter; who are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight." Characteristics such as these we hesitate not to impute to those who affect the greatest sanctity in our day; but we do not mean to impeach their integrity, or sincerity of purpose.

First of all, then, AS TO THE DIVINES. We conclude, with some of the most enlightened men of our age, that our clergy, and especially our state clergy, are generally stone-blind, infatuated, and deluded men, upon this momentous, practical, radical, every-day subject. Indeed, we cannot see how it could be otherwise, when we remember that there is a combination of circumstances too powerful in their nature to leave their judgments open to the question. Their earliest prepossessions and prejudices; the nursery instruction; the school and the college training; their ordination vows, and solemn oaths; all pledges to the conservatism of things as they are; their subscriptions to articles, and glossaries, and creeds;—all these things combine to render them the unconscious servants of Mammon.

Everybody knows that *Simony* is defined by the laws to be the crime of buying and selling church preferment: it is a crime because it is prohibited by law, many enact-

ments having been made to prevent the practice. The prohibition, then, is admitted; but what is the practice? Does money exert its influence in either the bestowment or the acquirement of church preferment? Is it possible for a man to obtain church preferment without money? This is a home question; it is as easily answered as it is plainly proposed.

Among the many steps or measures to be taken for the purpose of obtaining the end in view, church preferment—which is taken, *can* be taken, free of money? The training of the boy, the education of the adult intended for the church—can these initiatory steps be taken free of Mammon? After the regular schooling, our youth has a college life to lead. Is there no one at the portal there, to demand a toll or fee before he enters? Or when he enters, does he find that all is free from a Mammonian influence? His rooms, his furniture, the customs to which he must conform, the lectures he is required to attend, the dress he is obliged to wear, his associates, the whole tenor of his progress — all proceed upon money principles, all display the authority of Mammon. And when the clerical aspirant has taken his degree, and become a candidate for holy orders, is there no barrier of a pecuniary nature, where toll must be paid, standing in his way? He must have a title; and what is that? Why, he must find a curacy with an adequate *stipend*, before the Bishop will ordain him. That is soon accomplished; and we no sooner see our young Divine well settled in his curacy, than he, or his parents perchance, long for a living. But it will be said

that in all this process we touch not on church *preferment*, and that is the test of simony. Well, then, we see that no man can get into the church without the aid of Mammon: let us look about us to see whether or not, now we have obtained entrance for our aspirant, any of the good things of the Establishment can be procured for money; in plainer phrase, can we purchase good preferment for him? We could tell of one of the judges of the land who gave ten thousand guineas for an advowson, because he had a very stupid son at school who would not be fit for any profession except the church. A tradesman we know, who daily served in a greasy jacket and apron, who gave five thousand pounds for a living on the banks of the Thames, which was sold by public auction. We read in the newspapers of the day, that the corporation of Liverpool are putting up for sale the highest church preferment of that renowned city. But why multiply testimonies of a truth which is as notorious as the sun at noon-day? The conclusion cannot be evaded.

The statement may be considered a libel, but the plain fact of the case is, that a very large proportion of our State clergy enter the church for selfish purposes: the clerical office is regarded by them as a *profession*—a profession in which they not only expect to live, but in which they hope to rise—a profession deriving its charms, in their eyes, from its connexion with (using one of the cant terms of the day) worldly "respectability." Let the reader inquire, what is the inducement to that *Translation* (delicate phrase!) which all the Bishops have ever sought for? What is the primary and uniform reason on

account of which this translation is desired? Is it not because the emoluments are larger? And then with respect to the Chapters: let any man read the several pamphlets which have lately issued from the press, in particular those from the keen and witty Sidney Smith; that from the study of the cold and caustical Dr Spry; and that from the zealous minor canon, the Rev. Mr Packman, of St Paul's Cathedral;—and then say whether revenue, emolument, are not the first great ends and objects of all their pursuits and desires. And even where there is, it is charitably believed, a conscientious reference to benevolent usefulness, still there is, and from the nature of the system there ever must be, a reference to *preferment*—that is, to worldly honour and progressive emolument—which stamps upon the whole affair the impress of pervading and essential Mammonism.

Nor is this representation applicable to the state clergy only: it is applicable, in a greater or less degree, to the Divines of every sect and denomination in our land. Their reference to salaries; to "respectable" (by which they mean remunerative) situations; their arrangements relative to their intercourse with the world; and though last, not the least, their invariable deference in their congregations, or churches, or denominations, in their societies and institutions, to wealth, in the persons of its possessors—all demonstrate that they, as well as the clergy of the state, unconscious of the fearful fact they also may be, are the servants and ministers of a system which has the Antagonist of the Redeemer's Dispensation for its deity.

Christian reader, is it not the case now, as it was among the Israelites, in what is designated our modern Zion, as well as in ancient Jerusalem? Is not the testimony of Micah most strikingly applicable still—"The PRIESTS TEACH FOR HIRE, AND THE PROPHETS DIVINE FOR MONEY; yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us, no evil can come near us?"

Let us now see how this servitude of our Divines to Mammon operates in a most disastrous manner to the obstruction of the progress of the Christian Dispensation. First it places them at once under the influence of a radical error, which affects the very elements of their religious character, and poisons both the fountain and the current of their instructions and representations; then it impels them to render a conformity to the statutes of the god of this world, and the maxims and manners of his votaries, which saps the very foundation of vital Christianity, and either distorts, or misdirects, or paralyzes the useful efforts of conscientious diligence and zeal; and then it induces them entirely to forget or to overlook that missionary character which, in our opinion, is essential to their office. The instructions of Christ to his disciples are positive, and, we believe, irrepealable upon this point. (Compare Matt. xxviii, 19. Mark xvi, 15. Luke xxiv, 27.)

Now we lay it down as a maxim, that just in the degree that Christian Divines suffer their missionary functions, thus inseparable from their obedience to their Master, to merge in the ease, the luxury, the pomps

and the glories of the world, so must their apostolical character, as Christ's ministers, lose its essence, efficacy, and virtue:—aye, just in that degree do they become the dupes, the servants, the votaries of that being who is, in every practical sense of the word, the Antagonist of Almighty God under the Christian Dispensation. And almost in every case have these Divines, in this respect, obliterated their commission; and thus Mammon has betrayed them into a compromise with their duty. They make their arrangements, and raise their funds, to send others as missionaries; they say to the poor and needy of the flock—"Go YE and teach all nations," while they take good care to stay at home, to enjoy their rank and their dignities, their emoluments and their gains.

This is the compromise, this is the Mammonized Christianity, with which we would sustain our controversy. For we hold, that while these things remain, it is not possible for the blessings and promises of the Gospel to be realized by man, and therefore we assail them. Would that the time were at hand, when the professed ministers of Christ, disenthralled from the bondage of Mammon, to them so sweet that they "find music in the clanking of their chains," shall become what they ought to be—the heralds and precursors of the advent of the Son of God to the glories of his universal sovereignty, and the majesty of his mediatorial throne!

So much for our *Divines*. A similar character, we

sincerely regret, has to be given of THE SAINTS of the age. Try them by the criteria of infallible truth, and it will soon appear that they are not entitled to the designation of Christians.

What is a Christian? A Christian is an imitator of Jesus of Nazareth—one who obeys implicitly, and from the heart, the precepts of that divine person, and can stand in the light of the parables which he addressed to his disciples. All pretensions to Christianity, whether real or feigned, may be easily brought to this sure, this infallible test. Try the life and conduct—not the fancies and the professions,—try the life and conduct of any one distinguished for evangelical repute by this test—by the example, by the precepts, or by the parables of Christ, or by the whole three together, and you have a solution which cannot be erroneous. The best Christian will most resemble Jesus of Nazareth—the pseudo-Christian will resemble anything or any person else; and the probability is, that you will find him leagued under the banners of Antichrist, even the slave and dupe of Mammon himself.

Often we have cited the declaration of Our Lord, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;" but this divided service is universal among professing Christians; none of them can escape from the imputation. This attempted but impracticable neutrality—this supposition that any man *can* yield a divided service between God and Mammon—is not only the great pervading

vice of the religious world, but has led to the most extravagant and pernicious results. The truth is, that there are no persons more completely addicted to the love of Mammon than the pious *Saints*, as well as the orthodox Divines, of the age.

Follow, Christian reader, these Saints into the world —mark them in their everyday transactions among the children of men;—are they less desirous of gain—are they less grasping—are they less desirous of making profitable bargains and speculations—are they less absorbed in corroding anxiety relative to circumstantial success and advancing prosperity, than the most acknowledged and besotted servitors and votaries of Mammon? Where are we to detect a difference of character—where are we to discover a line of demarcation between the two? Where are we to discover the heart placed upon heavenly treasure; the affections set upon things above; the bold and uncompromising nonconformity to the world; the character of strangers and pilgrims upon the earth; the obedience of practice, as well as profession, to the precepts of our divine Master; the evidences of that spiritual consistency which is essential to vital Christianity? Where are we to find these indications of the godliness of the New Testament? The reader's own mind, and memory, and observation, can immediately furnish a reply.

Turn to the *precept*—"Lay not up treasure upon earth;"—why, some of our modern Saints, almost all of

them who have the opportunity, are numbered among the most inveterate hoarders and accumulators in the length and breadth of the land.

And then, as to "Giving to them that ask," lending to the borrower, and providing for the poor, the destitute, the diseased—are not the declared men of the world quite as extensive in their charities and as liberal in their transactions—nay, are they not often much more so, than those who arrogate the profession of peculiar faith and sanctity? Do we scandalize any one, when we say that our rich men—that our rich Christian (so called) men, are more inhuman, more heartless, than the untutored savage or the sanguinary cannibal? —Look ye now. How wild soever the sooty Indian is, will he suffer a fellow Indian to perish, he having abundance—as our rich and luxurious professors do? And how horrible soever the festivals of the cannibal may be, is it not under the strong impulse of revenge, an uncontrollable sense of injury, that he gluts himself with the blood of his enemy? If this be so, then is there nothing defamatory in this article of indictment against the rich—the rich Saints and professors of our city and country. The fact is, they sit at home, faring sumptuously every day, in the full enjoyment of all the luxuries of existence, while they know that many a fellow-creature is perishing by inches around them for lack of the common necessaries of life. This fact, this state of things, which is as open and notorious as the sun at noon-day, justifies the charge in question. Where, then, is the Christianity of the age?

With reference to the example of the Lord of the Christian Dispensation, which we have illustrated in some of our preceding pages—his example in becoming poor though he was rich, that we through his poverty might be rich;—who ever heard of such a thing, who ever *expects* to hear of such a thing, as one of our rich Saints making anything which bears the semblance of a *sacrifice* of property, for the supply of human destitution and the alleviation of human woe?

We can find but one solution to all this seeming confusion and paradox. It is this:—the Christianity of these money-seekers, these men who thus truckle to the god of wealth with the same pliancy as any infidel on the surface of the earth—their Christianity, we say, is spurious; their pretensions are false and hollow; and all their feelings and experiences of grace and sanctification are delusive. They have no genuine vital faith: if they had, it would be a faith which would "OVERCOME THE WORLD;" if they had, instead of placing their virtual confidence in gold, and saying to the fine gold, "Thou art my dependence," they would be fixing their regard, not on the things which are seen and which are temporal, but on the things which are unseen and eternal.

To these Saints—to these personages who uphold spiritual Christianity to the prejudice of that which is radical and practical, we say—what is the end of that spiritual conversion and of these attainments which give you the title of Saints and servants of the Lord?

Is the Christian Dispensation itself most advanced or most obstructed by your religious persuasions and exercises? Do your doctrines lead to truth or to error? Does your practice give plausibility to a system, and specious appearance to institutions, which are all based upon Mammonian principles? O that the Saints of the age would leave their work of conversion for a while, and would dedicate themselves to the extirpation of Mammon, and the mischiefs which the Evil One in this disguise has entailed upon us. Man wants—man stands permanently in need—of the actual promises—the real benefits of the Redeemer's Dispensation. He cannot have them while he holds to Mammon and his gifts—he can have them only by obeying the laws of the Redeemer's Dispensation in spirit and in truth.

It would be useless to pursue this painful subject further. We find universally prevailing in the professing world, that anti-christian estimate and love of wealth, with all its concomitants, which is the most inveterate disease to which the human intellect is obnoxious—a monomania apparently incurable. And when we refer to its aggregate influence, so far as the diffusion and victory of the Christian Dispensation are concerned, we hesitate not once more to assert, that the barrier which our *soi-disant* Saints and worldly-minded Divines raise against the advancement of that Dispensation upon the earth, is ten thousand times more formidable than that which is constituted by actual sin and open rebellion. It is in fact THE barrier; it is in truth THE impassable obstruction; and it must be burst asunder,

it must be annihilated, it must be "ground to powder," before the final triumph of truth and righteousness can be achieved.

Once more we appeal to the reader, if all these palpable facts and incontrovertible statements do not again bring us, with a force of conviction it is impossible to resist, to our conclusion—

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

Fain would we rub down the sharp edge of these asperities, as they bear upon any of our reverend friends and neighbours; but we cannot do so, except at the expense of both truth and usefulness. Yes: how stands the fact? Are the parties to whom we allude obnoxious to the charge of Mammonism, though they know it not! Do they, on this particular subject, teach for doctrine the subtleties of Mammonism? They must vindicate themselves; our charge is made in plain and intelligible terms, and they, as disputants, have many advantages over their accusers.

SECTION VI.

THE APOSTOLICAL REVELATION.

OUR hypothesis—MAMMON, ANTICHRIST—is not only redolent, as we have seen, with the most important possible practical influences and results, but it throws a brilliant light upon the Signs of the Times as existing phenomena, and so becomes the herald of approaching events.

Is it a truth, that all our national institutions are based on wealth, cemented by wealth?

Is it a truth that the god, or genius, of this wealth is all antagonism with the spirit and genius of the Christian Dispensation?

Is it a truth that the Christian Dispensation is, under the fiat of Almighty God, a crescent, growing progressive Dispensation, so that the kingdom of our Messiah is ultimately to be universal on the earth?

We submit, if these several positions be scriptural truths, who can deny that they tell of those things which are coming on the earth? who does not see that just as

the Christian Dispensation makes its advances in the world, so must all those systems or institutions which have Mammon for their deity shake, tremble, fall. The Dispensation of Christianity came forth from Almighty God invested with a fiat, a nature, and a purpose, that must surmount all obstructions. It was ordained, that at first it should be the least of all the seeds that are sown in the earth; and then, that of the increase of its growth there should be no end until the invisible seed has become so large a tree, that all the fowls of heaven shall make their nests in its boughs, and under its branches shall all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under its shadow all nations shall dwell.

It may well be said, with respect to the Christian Dispensation, "Lord! how marvellous are thy ways! who shall find them out?" There are, however, a few prominent facts in the history of this Dispensation upon which every sincere and good common-sense believer may safely repose. It was announced of old, by inspired prophets, three hundred years before the coming of the Messiah, that when he did come, the kings of the earth would conspire, and that the rulers would take counsel together against his Dispensation. It is recorded on the pages of authentic history, that when the promised Messiah had arrived, the high priests and elders of the people did confederate and take counsel together, and did persuade the multitude to put this holy person to an open and ignominious death. Thus the prophecy was fulfilled. It is again declared by the mouth of inspired prophets, that the time is coming when all kings shall be as fos-

tering fathers, and their queens as nursing mothers to the church. This prophecy also, we may perceive, is in the course of fulfilment.

To mark the SIGNS OF THE TIMES in which we live as they bear upon this prophecy, is an employment which, though worthy of the most distinguished talent, is yet not out of the reach of the most humble intellect. The consideration that the time is yet to come when the Christian Dispensation shall no more require the aid of inspired men or apostles, of priests or preachers—that is to say, when men "shall no more say, Know ye the Lord," but when all shall be professors of the faith of the Redeemer—this is level to any capacity. The question is, whether the Christian Dispensation has not almost, indeed already, reached this time; whether, if even this generation do not touch upon this epoch, this crisis; in other words, whether the end and object which the Redeemer had in view, when he directed his Apostles to go forth and preach the Gospel to every creature, has not already gained its ultimatum; and, consequently, whether the era be not at hand for the full development and final triumph of his kingdom upon the earth.

In the twenty-fourth chapter of St Matthew's Gospel, we find this momentous question thus plainly proposed. We read that as the Redeemer sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him, saying, "Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be

the sign of thy coming, and the end of the world?"—as a world sunk in iniquity and ruin. "Then Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars; see that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes in various places,—all these are the beginnings of sorrows." Then he tells the Apostles how they, in particular, shall be persecuted and hated of all nations for his name's sake, and concludes, as to our proposition, in these plain and unequivocal words:—"This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come."

Are we at a loss to determine what end the Redeemer spoke of as then to come forth, when his Gospel should have been preached to all nations? Can we be ignorant of the SIGN of the coming of this end? Or when we look abroad and contemplate this notorious fact, that this Gospel of the kingdom is now actually preached and published in all the world as a witness unto all nations, shall we deny the application of the prophecy to the times in which we live? O no! Difficulties many, and stumbling-blocks many, have from age to age been thrown in the Christian's way by a benighted world; but the light of Gospel truth has long since

dawned; it is shining more and more, and we of this generation may be called to witness the refulgence of the perfect day.

The orthodox Churchman has an insuperable impediment placed before him. The Rubrick, or heading of the chapters of our Gospels, as received by the church, carries out the idea that the end here spoken of by the Redeemer, beyond the end of the world, is the day of judgment. The Collects, too, deprecate the doctrine, and the Creeds falsify the Christian's hope, of the Redeemer's kingdom on the earth. But let it be remembered that this Rubrical and Canonical interpretation is all of human invention; and let the confiding Christian turn from these doctrines of men to the Saviour of the world. He came to deliver the world, as a world—mortal man, as such—from the slavery and thraldom of sin. He was incarnate for this purpose, to redeem mankind from all the evils entailed upon the human race by the transgression of the first pair. This the Son of God came to accomplish. We must leave it, then, to the authors of the Rubrick, as well as those who prepared the Collects, the Formularies, and the Creeds of our church, to prove the consistency of their faith, when they assume that the Redeemer of the world, either cannot, or will not, in his own pre-determined time, carry out the END and OBJECT of his incarnation to the utmost perfection. He who believes that He will not reign supreme on the earth, that his Kingdom will not be perfect here, that the will of God will not be as implicitly and universally obeyed by mortals as it

is by ministering angels above, disbelieves and distrusts his Saviour.

Are we not warranted, then, in considering the symptoms of the approach of Messiah's kingdom which now prevail, as a distinguishing SIGN of the TIMES? And is not this Sign a natural consequence of that preaching and publishing of the Gospel, which, under the immediate direction of the Messiah, has been incessantly in progress for more than eighteen hundred years? The Sign, therefore, must not be despised as the bright illusion of an elevated enthusiast, or the dull foreboding of the cloistered superstitious.

The Apostle of the Redeemer's Dispensation, who was more immediately employed in the Vocation of the Gentiles, anticipating the great End which is here contemplated, told his converts at Thessalonica, that when the predicted period for the full consummation of the Saviour's kingdom should arrive, it should be marked by this event—the DISCOVERY of ANTICHRIST. This sign may now, at any day, be added to that of the diffusion of the word of Gospel truth over the four quarters of the globe. Antichrist may be made plainly visible to any rational believer in the divinity of Jesus Christ—meaning, that if we believe Jesus to have been the Son of God, we shall not suffer any human interpretation, however sanctioned or sanctified, to sully or obscure the brightness of his truth.

THE DISCOVERY OF ANTICHRIST, then, has been

rendered a mark, a sign, in our copy of the New Testament, of the coming of the kingdom of the Son of God. As it is the policy of worldly minds to mystify and corrupt the evangelical truth, so it must be the policy and the desire of the real Christian to disabuse himself and others from such corruption.

ANTICHRIST IS NOW DISCOVERED—MAMMON, ANTICHRIST.

The passage in the Apostolic writings to which we are now adverting, is, 2 Thess. ii, 8: "And then shall that Wicked . . . . . be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."

The believer has the following series of events certified to him, as solid matters of fact, in this apostolical tradition:

1. The certainty of the second coming of the Redeemer to this earth to reign thereon;

2. The remoteness of the period when this event shall be accomplished, taking our stand at the time when the Apostle wrote;

3. The Apostacy of the Church in the interim, the falling away of that community to which the preaching of the Gospel was first committed;

4. The subsequent development or discovery of the potential Antagonist of the Redeemer's Dispensation;

5. The destruction, deposition, and annihilation of that Antagonist.

We assume, then, as admitted premises; First, that this prediction was written under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit of the Most High; Secondly, that the great event or consummation which the Apostle foretells, is the second advent of the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven; Thirdly, that the first great end and object to be consummated by this advent, is the utter annihilation of that Wicked . . . . . who has exercised his malignant disposition towards the human race in every age of the world; and then there is a Fourth point, which, for the purpose of this essay, is entitled to separate consideration, the Discovery or Revelation of this Wicked . . . . . as immediately connected with the second advent of the Son of Man.

Let the reader observe the remarkable void, the impressive blank or hiatus, which occurs in the passage we are now considering: "Then shall that Wicked . . . ." person, or spirit, or creature, "be revealed." This significant and evidently intended blank we venture to fill up, and we read the passage thus—Then shall Mammon, that Wicked Antagonist of the Redeemer's kingdom, be revealed, whose destruction and annihilation shall be accomplished at the coming of the Son of God.

This text of sacred prophecy so interpreted will produce light enough to illuminate our apothegm to the most simple understanding. If Mammon be that Wicked . . . . . agent, or being, or power; and if this substantive matter of fact be now for the first time to be revealed to the world in all its native simplicity and truth, then we see why the dominion of Antichrist, with all its appendages of error, and superstition, and fanaticism, is already shaking to its foundations.

The being, so emphatically designated by the Apostle "That Wicked . . . . ." is called by him, in a preceding verse of the same chapter, "The Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition." Let the reader bring the character of this Being, given by the Apostle, into juxta-position with the character presented to him of Mammon in the preceding pages, and then let him decide for himself upon their identity.

"*The Man of Sin*," according to St Paul, was a usurper, assuming the character and prerogatives of a deity; he was the Antagonist of God in our world; he had gained the ascendancy in the temple and in the sanctuary, as well as the state: Why, this is the very character of Mammon, the god of this world; this is the very description already given of Mammon as Antichrist! The Apostle further declares concerning this "Man of Sin," this "Son of Perdition," this Wicked . . . . .," that his influence, as "the mystery of iniquity," already worked in the days in which his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians was written. Even then

Mammonism had begun to invade and contaminate the church; the subtle poison was already working and circulating among the professors of the faith; and although for a time it was partially repressed and concealed by the influence of persecution, its effects were soon fearfully developed in the adulteration of all that was excellent in the system and the operation of Christianity, by the spirit, the maxims, and the degrading dominion, of the world.

It is obvious that the Apostle lays great stress upon the event of the DISCOVERY of this mystery of iniquity —"Then shall that wicked be REVEALED." Revealed? By whom? By what agency, instrumentality, or means? We will venture upon a conjecture in answer to that query.

Our prophetic Apostle, in the first of his Epistles to the Corinthians, has this remarkable passage touching the agency which the Lord of the Christian Dispensation will be pleased to employ in the future development of his kingdom upon earth: "Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are, that no flesh should glory in his presence."

Let the reader place us in what part of this category he pleases, our bold assumption is, that we do see our calling, and that this calling is, to proclaim, with all our energy and perseverance, the Discovery of Antichrist. And seeing that the humblest instruments are often employed for the accomplishment of the mightiest purposes; seeing that there is nothing so contemptible as to the world, which the Lord God Almighty may not make use of in the revelation of his kingdom to mankind; we have assumed that to this puny essay it may belong to become the honoured instrument of bringing out to public notice that occurrence or revelation in question; and that our problem or apothegm, MAMMON—ANTICHRIST, may be the fulfilment and realization of the Apostle's prediction, "Then shall that Wicked . . . . . be revealed."

The word "THEN," in the declaration of the Apostle, is full of import. "THEN"—that is, at the END; the *End*, which we have just seen has been decisively and clearly distinguished by our Lord himself in his address to his disciples; the *End* which shall come when "the Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all nations." *Then*, at this *End*, shall this Wicked . . . . be revealed.

Well, then, has this marvellous result been actually brought to pass? Is the case really so, that there is now no civilized nation under the sun, which has not received the good tidings of this glorious Gospel in its own vernacular tongue? We do not hesitate to assert that our conviction is—

The Gospel is now preached as a witness unto all nations, therefore THE END IS AT HAND!

There is one more important particular in this apostolical prophecy, which must not escape our notice. It is that the recovery of the world from the trammels of the Wicked One (no matter whether we call him Satan, Beelzebub, Belial, Apollyon, or Mammon), *will never be accomplished by mere human instrumentality.* The *Revelation*, or exposure of the person, seat, and province of Antichrist, may be made by any insignificant, and, in the estimation of the world, contemptible agent; but the *Demolition* of the great Antagonist is expressly reserved for the Redeemer himself, and for the time of his second coming to our globe. "Then shall that Wicked . . . . be revealed, whom THE LORD *shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy* WIH THE BRIGHTNESS OF HIS COMING." Thus the downfall and demolition of Antichrist are to be accomplished by THE LORD; the Apostle's Lord, our Lord, the Redeemer; HE shall pull down and annihilate the Man of Sin. And how? "By the *Spirit of his Mouth;*" what the prophet Isaiah called, "The rod of his mouth;" * what the Apostle John called, "The sharp sword that goeth out of his mouth, that with it he should smite the nations."† And by "The Brightness of his Coming," we understand that period of glory described by inspiration, when heaven shall be opened, when the Faithful and True in triumph shall

* Isa. xi, 4. † Rev. xix. 15.

appear, his eyes as a flame of fire, on his head many crowns, the angelic hosts his resplendent retinue, his name King of Kings and Lord of Lords; while the voice of the inhabitants of a regenerated world shall ascend as the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluiah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!

Thus we hail the discovery of this fact, Mammon—ANTICHRIST, as the herald and harbinger to announce the fulness of times for the complete development and perfect triumph of the Redeemer's Dispensation on the earth.

SECTION VII.

MAMMON — ANTICHRIST.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

In the preceding observations we have referred to the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and to the necessity of diligently marking them. No one can deny, who gives even a superficial consideration to the subject, that our times are extraordinary, eventful, portentous, perilous, and altogether unprecedented. And this with especial reference to the power and influence of Mammon. There never was a time when so much was done in the way of legislation, for the protection of property in the hands of the overgrown rich. There never was a time when so much was done in the way of legislation, to depress the value of labour. There never was a time when so much was done in the way of legislation, to cut down the provisions of the poor to the lowest possible ebb. There never was a time until now, when poverty and destitution were treated as criminal; when the prey, the victim of distress, was apprehended by the police-officer, carried before the civil magistrate, and committed to prison as a delinquent against the laws.

All this argues well for the Christian Dispensation. This state of things cannot last; the depravity of the system which tolerates such atrocities as these, cannot long disguise its deformity in a land where the Gospel is everywhere preached.

Indications of a change are already apparent. The head of our church himself, the Lord Primate of England, not many years since, charged the clergy to consider, that we "live in one of those periods which are called ERAS in the history of the world;" his Grace, at the same time, expressing himself under great alarm at the inroads which some (to him) unseen power is making upon the institutions of the earth. "The signs of a storm are black in the horizon," says the first of our political leaders.* "Yes," saith another doctor of another college†—"yes, the heavens are gathering, and let rulers of parties do what they may, the storm will come; and the religion to survive will be that which is least beset with the trammels of sectarianism, and most imbued with a spirit of charity toward all mankind." Another modern seer of our age says—"What times are coming on the earth we know not; but the general expectation of persons of all characters, in all nations, is an instinct implanted by God to warn us of a coming storm. Not one nation only, but all; not one class of thinkers, but all; they who fear, and they who hope, and who fear and hope things opposite; they who are

* Lord John Russell's Letter to his Constituents,—1839.

† Dr Vaughan.

immersed in their worldly schemes, and they who look for some coming of God's kingdom; they who watch this world's signs, and they who watch for the next—alike have their eyes intently fixed on somewhat which is coming; though whether it be the vials of his wrath, or the glories of his kingdom, or whether the one shall be the herald of the other, none can tell. They who calculate what is likely, speak of it; they who cannot, feel its coming; the spirits of the unseen world seem to be approaching to us, and awe comes on us, and trembling which makes all the bones to shake. Times of trouble there have been before, but such a time in which everything, everywhere, tends in one direction, to one mighty struggle, of one sort—of faith with infidelity, lawlessness with rule, Christ with Antichrist—there never seems to have been till now. The ancient images of Antichrist are growing old and decaying."*

Another keen observer of the times† says—"There are signs of a revolution beginning; a more important one, by its higher principle and its expansive impulse towards a wide and remote beneficence, than the ordinary events of that name. What have commonly been the matter and circumstance of revolutions? The last deciding blow in a deadly competition of equally selfish parties; actions and reactions of ambition and revenge; the fiat of a conqueror; a burst of blind fury suddenly

* Dr Pusey. † Foster.

sweeping away an old order of things, but overwhelming, too, all attempts to substitute a better institution; plots, massacres, battles, dethronements, restorations; all actuated by a fermentation of the ordinary or the basest elements of humanity. How little of the sublime of moral agency has there been, with one or two partial exceptions, in these mighty commotions; how little wisdom, or virtue, or reference to the supreme patron of national interests; how little nobleness, or even distinctness of purpose, or consolidated advantage of success! But here is, as we trust, the approach of a revolution with different phenomena. It displays the nature of its principle and its ambition, in a conviction far more serious and extensive than heretofore, of the necessity of education to the mass of the population, with earnest discussions of its scope and methods by both speculative and practical men; in schemes more speedily animated into operation than good designs were wont to be, for spreading useful knowledge over tracts where there were none; in exciting tens of thousands of young persons to a benevolent and patient activity in the instruction of the children of the poor; in an extended and extending system of means and exertions for the universal diffusion of the sacred Scriptures; in multiplying endeavours in all regular and in all uncanonical ways to render it next to impossible for the people not to hear some sounds, at least, of the voice of religion; in the formation of useful local institutions, too various to come under one denomination; in enterprises to attempt the opening of the vast prison-houses of human spirits in dark, distant regions; in

bringing to the test of principles many notions and practices which have stood on the authority of prejudice, custom, and prescription: and all this, taking advantage of the new and powerful spirit which has come on the world to drive its affairs into commotion and acceleration; as bold adventurers have sometimes availed themselves of a formidable torrent to be conveyed whither the stream, in its ordinary course, would never have carried them; or, as we have heard of heroic assailants seizing the moment of a tempest to break through the enemies' lines. Such are some of the insignia by which it stands distinguished out and far off from the rank of ordinary revolutions. . . . . It is a revolution in the manner of estimating the souls of the people, and consequently, in what should be done for both their present and future welfare. Through many ages, that immense multitude had been but obscurely presented to view in any such character as that of rational improvable creatures. They were recognised no otherwise than as one large mass of rude moral substance, but faintly distinguishable into individuals; existing, and so left to exist, in their own manner; and that manner hardly worth concern or inquiry. Little consideration could there be of how much *spiritual immortal essence* must be *going to waste*, absorbed in the very earth, all over the wide field where the inferior portion of humanity was seen only through the gross medium of an economical estimate, by the more favoured part of the race. But now it is as if a mist were arising and dispersing from that field, and leaving the multitude of uncultivated and degraded

minds exhibited in a light in which they were never seen before, except by the faithful promoters of Christianity, and a few philanthropists of a less special order."

See how another beneficed Divine paints the phenomena of our times, quite unconscious that it is the Christian Dispensation advancing on the world, and vindicating its own origin:—"What are the signs of the times in which we live? The striking feature of the present day is change. It is reform or ruin: it is moral revolution. Every political and religious institution is threatened. Reforms are made in the state and in the church. The churches are attacked; sweeping reforms are demanded, and must be conceded. The tide of innovation has set in, and it rolls irresistibly onward, sweeping all before it. Vain are the efforts of apostolicals and conservatives to oppose it; it sweeps onward, and engulfs churches, convents, orders, islands, and mountains. . . . . There are signs of an approaching earthquake in the natural world; and there are signs of the coming revolution in the moral world. The lowering cloud of disaffection, the low murmurings of discontent, the shaking of the earth, the darkening of the heavens, all forebode the awful shock."*

Here, fellow Christian, let us pause awhile, and

* See 'The Crisis,' by the Rector of Lusby, p. 176-7.

reflect deliberately upon all these sad forebodings and direful fears. Mark we well, the high-priests and elders of the people of our times are in a state of great perturbation and trouble at some calamities, or changes, or convulsions, which they apprehend to be coming on the earth. But what have we to fear—we the multitude—we who minister to their luxuries, their riches, their power? It is all hope with us. All that we have to do is, to ascertain, if possible, whether it be the actual advance of the Gospel light, the near approach of the Spirit of the Christian Dispensation, which makes all the bones of these great ones so to shake. The vials of wrath to them may be heavenly boons to us. The ancient images of Antichrist, they now confess, have become obsolete and worthless. Why? Was it not because they were *false* images, the *ignes fatui* of ecclesiastical imaginations? And may we not assume that it is the advanced light of the Redeemer's Dispensation shining upon these images, which exposes their deformity and worthlessness? Let us consider well that these are all *consecrated* images—images, which the two great churches of modern Christendom, Rome and England, have invented, have carved, have decorated, have gilded. But their mock consecration only increases their delusion and their weakness. They are tottering on their pedestals; they are ghastly in decay; they shall soon moulder into ruin; and, together with that Mammonism, that Antichrist, which is at once their common basis and their common support, they shall be trampled into dust before the coming of Him, who shall soon establish his personal reign, and sway

his mediatorially authoritative sceptre to the remotest limits of the habitable globe.

This, then, is our argument; that with the march of intellect, with the diffusion of knowledge, with the increasing demand for civil and religious liberty, so MUST, as a matter of *moral necessity*, so MUST the light of the Redeemer's Dispensation expand upon the earth.

And what can be more delightful and animating, as well as more true and incontrovertible, than such considerations? These are anticipations which elevate us far above the jarring and clashing elements of human interests; they abstract us from the confusion which is inseparable from a constant reference to inferior agencies and subordinate instrumentalities; and they induce us to hail the rapidly approaching arrival of the inevitable period, when the sublime declaration shall be uttered from the excellent glory: "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever!"

It must further be remarked as one of the Signs of the Times, that the great obstacle to the accomplishment of this heart-inspiring prediction is not merely Mammon, considered *generally* as the Antagonist of Almighty God in the Christian Dispensation, but that particular species of Mammonism which assumes the form of Conservatism in Church and State. The inconsistency, the utter and irreconcilable inconsistency

of this Conservatism with true Christianity, it will require very little effort to demonstrate.

And here we must digress for a moment, to make one incidental remark.

Politicians, in the general sense of the word, we are none—partisanship we disdain. We know nothing of politics, but that which is manifestly founded upon good morals; of morals we know nothing, but that which has true religion as its basis; and of religion we know nothing, beyond that which comes home to our hearts and understandings as Revelation from Almighty God in the Gospel records. The principles which we maintain, and which we believe to be essentially Christian, are one and the same, whether they refer to politics or to religion; and they exercise an influence, a pervading power, extending to all that belongs to spiritual faith or secular citizenship. But to return.

"*A Christian Conservative!*" Reader, can you find a phrase more completely anomalous, more directly contradictory than this?

What is the first wish, the most earnest prayer, the sincerest act of the Conservative? Is it not to say *Esto perpetua* to things as they are? Is it not his maxim that all things are just as they should be?

But what is the first wish, the most earnest prayer

of the sound and honest Christian? Does it not involve immediate repentance, radical change, reform here, restitution there, regeneration everywhere? Can any wisdom reconcile this? "No," says the Conservatist, "we keep the things that differ asunder. One thing applies to politics, another thing to religion." Aye, there it is, fellow Christian! The man of the world cloaks himself under the ambiguity of the word *religion;* he does not understand how it is that the friendship of the world is enmity with God; he does not see that the friendships of the world are either leagues of pleasure, or confederacies of vice; he is not aware that Mammon, the god of this world, is to him a sovereign. We, fellow Christian, having no political bearing to uphold militating against Christian views and Christian duties, can easily see how the game of political conservatism is played by those who hold the trumps.

This, then, is the plain state of the case; the Conservatism of which we have been speaking, presupposes that whatever is, is *right;* while Christianity presupposes that all things are in a depraved, degenerate state; and its necessary, its *intended* influence is to change, to ameliorate this state, by the utter eradication of all that is offensive to God or injurious to man. Upon the supposition, then, that Christianity is right, Conservatism is wrong.

The great desideratum of which the world stands in need, is Regeneration and Redemption; Reform and

Reorganization upon principles as yet unknown in practice,—this is what is demanded for the human race — and this is what the Christian Dispensation, and the Christian Dispensation alone, can afford. What sort of Christians or Regenerators, then, are they who devote all their energies, and employ all their influence, to maintain the stability of things as they are?

The Jews rejected the Messiah because they were Conservatives, pledged and wedded to existing institutions. The fact is, that Conservatism is one of the most stubborn types or forms that infidelity can assume; and it is so, because it is one of the darkest, the most imposing, the most besotting. With this Conservatism, it is impossible that the faith, the professions, and the prayers of the Christian can be reconciled. Our hope, our prayer, our belief is, that the Spirit of the Times, which is agitating the world in every civilized state, is the Holy Spirit of the Christian Dispensation; we therefore look and we long for the final downfall of all those institutions which are superstructed on any heathen, infidel, Antichristian foundation.

And here, again, the Signs of the Times confirm our assurance that the great end is approaching. The common people, the great bulk of the population of the land, are no longer infatuated by the sorceries, or deluded by the juggleries of Conserva-

tism; they have a plain perception of its obstructive, injurious, and oppressive tendency; they are gradually emancipating themselves from that subservience to wealth and its concomitants, to which their predecessors were wont to yield themselves; the rights of man, as man, are better understood; and already so advanced is the progress of the Redeemer's Dispensation, that all men begin to perceive that some great crisis or consummation is at hand. Who, then, will not be ready to confess, that we live in a season which may be compared to the morning of a glorious day? Is there not a palpable dawn spread over the mountains which bound the distant horizon? Are we to be disappointed in our expectations? Are our hopes to be frustrated? Is not the effulgence which is rising upon the moral world a matter of prophecy? Have the inspired prophets hitherto been in error as to the events which have already taken place, and which have constituted the subject-matter of their predictions as to the past? Have not all been accomplished in every minute particular? Why, then, need we be afraid of reckoning with certainty upon the accomplishment of these happy tidings which they have given relative to events which are still enwrapt in the womb of time? Are not the prophecies *promises?* Can that glorious Being who has given the promise be faithless or forgetful? "Is he man that he should lie, or the son of man that he should repent?" Are not the prophecies not only promises, but *results* — results of the purposes of that Jehovah who sees the

end from the beginning, whose counsel *shall* stand, and who will do all his pleasure? And are not the blessings, whose certain bestowment is announced in the prophecies, *boons* paid on Calvary, — *treasures* purchased on the cross?

SECTION VIII.

MAMMON—ANTICHRIST.

RESULTS OF THE DISCOVERY.

To what great or good end can such a discovery as that described in the preceding pages conduct the world? Eventually, we submit, it will conduct to the greatest good of which the world, as a world, is susceptible—to bring it back to its original sinless, paradisiacal state, in the universal triumph of the Christian Dispensation, and the glorious reign of the adorable Redeemer?

The first application of our principle may be disastrous and appalling; it may involve subversion and demolition: and all our conventions and institutions which have worldly wealth for their basis and support, may be brought to crumble into the dust: What then? must not the old rubbish be removed, before the foundations of the new edifice can be laid, and its walls can be reared?

So many advantages arising from our principle have been incidentally mentioned in the preceding pages, that any protracted argument, in the prosecution of our

present inquiry, is evidently unnecessary. Only a few supplementary observations we submit to our readers.

Our apothegm — MAMMON, ANTICHRIST—rightly understood, and taken as a great fundamental principle in the providence of God, furnishes a ready solution to the perplexities and difficulties which now embarrass mankind in all their private, and in all their state affairs. Can my Lord John This, or Sir Robert That, alter the nature of things? Each of them may have his own way of adjusting the elements committed to his keeping; but if the elements themselves are vicious, diseased, and polluted, the result will be the same—disappointment and discomfiture *must* follow. Thus, by the aid of our principle, we can discover why all the recent attempts at Reform in our political institutions have proved so unsatisfactory and so futile. The truth is, that all these matters of reform amount to nothing more than new modifications of old, decayed, and vicious materials. The truth is that our world, and especially they who preside at the helm of the state vessel—aye, all of us—we stand in need of REGENERATION—regeneration in our fundamental principles—and therefore it is that circumstantial reform can do nothing for us ultimately.

Can anything be conceived more completely Antichristian than the present state and condition of society here, in the metropolis of the most civilized and professing nation on the earth? Is there any other nation so burdened with its immense wealth, and with its mass of destitution and distress? Have we not thousands who

know not where to invest their accumulations, and tens of thousands who languish, droop, and die in utter want?

In this point of view then the question presents itself, Are we a Christian people?—a people zealous and active in the pursuit of Christian objects by the performance of Christian laws and elementary principles?

The foregoing essay is based upon the assumption that we are *not* a Christian people; but, quite the contrary; that we are a Mammon-ridden race, and therefore practical Infidels.

That we are a people who have received the holy Gospel of the Redeemer's Dispensation from our predecessors; and that we are exceedingly careful about handing the same down to our descendants; this is fully admitted. But that we are a people who show forth the divine excellency of the Dispensation itself by our lives and actions, we boldly and entirely deny. The testimony and the argument on which we ground this opinion are in your hands—Christian Reader, "we speak as unto wise men, judge ye."

Are WE, Britons, a CHRISTIAN PEOPLE?

This is a startling, a rude, and a repulsive question. But we must be allowed to repeat it, until something more definite and substantial than contemptuous reproof is furnished in reply.

Let us change the issue of our query; and ask any one of our most exalted and dignified prelates this personal question. "Sir, are you an *honest* man?"

Must not they who surround the pontifical palace admit that we must look into the life and actions of the individual for an answer to our question?—Of what use were it to recount the many excellent essays which his Grace had written and published on the virtue of honesty? Or to refer to the numberless opportunities, of which he had availed himself, to descant upon the same subject? No; to conduct we must resort, for the TRUTH.

Well, then, the good of our revelation, in the first instance, will be to show the utter depravity, impolicy, inhumanity, and unchristian spirit of a state of society such as this. It will open men's eyes to the truth; and the truth once embraced, consequences of the most momentous character will naturally ensue.

It is with the highest satisfaction that we advert to the *authority* of a recently elevated dignitary of our own church, upon these momentous points. Our object has been to prove the great political evils under which the body-politic of our age suffers; hear now, Christian Reader, what the venerable (not aged) ARCHDEACON of SURRY says upon the subject.

"It is of great moment for ourselves also, my reverend

brethren, that we realise this conviction; that we look on the holy things in which we minister as being in very deed our nation's safeguard. Such a persuasion will lead us to take not only a faithful, but a thoughtful and *reasonable view of all the troubled and changing scene around us.* Without this, while, through God's blessing on our labours, we may do good to individuals, we shall never call out the dormant powers with which the whole system of the Church is really instinct for the *healing* of our age. It is of no use to rail against the spirit of the times in which God has cast our lot: our business is to mould and sanctify it; and this we may do, if we bring the influence of the Church to bear upon it. For, even in its worst forms, we may commonly find that what is called *the spirit of the age rests upon some real want* of man and society—upon some want which the Church can and ought to satisfy, and which is *turned to evil* through the absence of this its lawful satisfaction.

"Thus, for instance, at this moment *two causes* mainly lie at the root of all those convulsions by which the peace and order of society are threatened—*the unequal distribution of property*, and the want of a common bond of unity." Thousands are gorged with repletion, whilst tens of thousands languish, aye perish of destitution! and this the Lord's doing! Forgive us, merciful Heaven! "Now both of these undoubtedly are the result of a highly unnatural and, in many respects, *diseased state of society:* and *the craving for their redress is not in itself evil.* It becomes evil only when it seeks the mock-

ing, selfish world as its redressor; instead of seeking, as it ought to, the power of Christ's Church.

"For, take for a moment the second of these causes: is it not true that there is *a great and widening* separation in this land between the various classes of society, and even between man and man? Thus the bonds which of old held the high and low of English society together are melting away. Where, for instance, amongst our vast manufacturing population, are the old bonds of mutual affection and respect—of national care on the one side, and generous trust upon the other—by which the peasantry and gentry were united? And this *poison* cannot be anywhere present in the circulation of the body politic, without reaching, more or less, to every part—it creeps on to the trading classes, to the shop-keeping classes, and thence even to rural districts. This change is passing upon the very conditions of social life in England; and at the same moment, and from the action of the same causes, the straiter bonds of family life and subjection are wearing out; children are becoming more independent, and brethren therefore more disunited. And yet men are so constituted as to crave after union and co-operation: in the bitterness of spirit, therefore, which waits on this increasing separation, they look around for some new bonds which may replace the old. It seems to them that *religion* has been hitherto *one of their divid s;* for they have known her only in the multitude of sects; and so they turn from her, and vainly hope to find in common interests, and the

jugglery of sensual promises, a cement strong enough to hold together their pretended social system. Now, how are such men to be met? Not by railing against their desire of combination, for this rests on a true longing of man's heart—it is the *cry of their souls against the misery* around them; but by showing them that the Church is this healer of division; that in her unity, and in it alone, the selfish, jarring hearts of men may be indeed charmed to concord. My reverend brethren, there is at this moment a special call upon us to believe and act upon this truth; to proclaim it fearlessly, that division is not of Christ; to teach in all our parishes, and carry out the truth in all our plans, that in the Church is the secret of unity for which men's hearts are thirsting. What were it not to do for England, to bring these healing powers to bear upon our torn and disaffected multitudes; to bring our great cities, with all their busy swarming life, to bow down in the fellowship of a true faith before the altar of a common Redeemer.

"And so of the other great cause of separation. No reasonable man can doubt that *the idolatry of property* is, at this time, one of our *prime national sins.* And has not God so ordered things, that rich and mighty nations, when they do become entangled in *this idol-worship*, shall become also His avengers on themselves; that the careless selfish rich shall become the prey of the untrained violent needy; that *the feebleness of all human institutions*, when they rest not upon God's word, shall, sooner or more late, be thoroughly proclaimed by all the horrors and agonies which wait on civil strife?

"And what is the only redressor of this evil? Not the somewhat unpalatable truths of political economy, nor the iron sinews of a proclaimed necessity, which must always sound as a taunt in the sufferer's ear. When did these ever allay such tumults? No, my reverend brethren, Christ's Church, and it alone, can heal these evils. She who can stand between these two classes: who can bind both in a common unity; who can teach the rich man that all he has are talents; that man must hang on man; that *the* sin, ay, *and the robbery*, begins with him, if he uses for himself what was but lent to him to use for others; who can tell the poor man that he is God's pensioner, and the rich that he is God's almoner; who can show to the one *the fearful danger of wealth*, and to the other *the dignity* and *blessedness of Christian poverty;* who can teach both that it is 'God who hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked, that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another.' *

"This work, my reverend brethren, we must do, or our land is lost. I will not scruple to say, that I believe we have not done it hitherto enough. We have not enough enforced upon the rich the conditions upon which they hold their riches. We have allowed small alms to multiply; we have not claimed, and therefore not received, those full offerings with which the Church ought to

* 1 Cor. xii. 24, 25.

equalise the inequalities of poverty and wealth. Hence have sprung many of our troubles; we have *ourselves* in the minds of the ignorant become *identified* with the idol-worshippers of property."

Say now, Christian Reader, is this mere *badinage*, empty declamation, clerical preaching; or is it plain, staid matter of fact and truth? Does this inhuman, this atrocious disparity in the distribution of wealth actually obtain in the land; and is such iniquity consecrated by prelatic authority? In one word, is not Mammon Antichrist?

Nothing in nature can be more easily understood, than the Nosology or symptoms of the disease under which the body corporate of the nation at this time labours. It is a mere common sense induction to the man, who will take a clear and candid view of our system of political economy. Everybody knows that wealth has been flowing into this kingdom from every part of the habitable globe; everybody may know that the course which this stream of wealth has taken in its distribution, has been to make the already rich still more rich, and the already deplorably poor still more destitute. All contrivances have been adopted, how to get the labour of the poor at the lowest possible price, and how to keep the destitute alive at the least possible cost. The consequence of all which is, that both parties are thereby depraved. In the first case, riches are a certain snare to those who place their reliance upon them; and

in the second place, wherever squalid poverty prevails, there will dishonesty and prostitution abound.

The particular vice of our vicious system seems, therefore, to lie in the third great division of our articles of political economy; that is to say, not in the article as to *Production;* not in the article as to *Consumption;* but in the article as to *Distribution.* The wealth of the world in itself is not an evil: this we admit. We are disposed to compare it, as Lord Bacon has done, to the manure with which the farmer refreshes and fecundates his land. And this homely comparison shows the special point of our case. Everybody perceives that where manure is left in large masses on the land, it not only smothers the vegetable soil beneath, but it produces nothing but rank and noxious weeds; it must be well, equably, and thoroughly spread abroad upon the wide surface, to make it the agent of good.

Wealth, then, if distributed under that system which the Lord of the Christian Dispensation has prescribed, would be one of those boons which a merciful Providence has bestowed upon man. But, on the other hand, wealth collected and distributed under the system with which Mammon governs the world—a system which exhibits hundreds of human beings suffering from repletion and excess, with thousands who languish and perish in want—we say that wealth, so possessed by the world, has become its bane and its misery.*

* "I cannot call Riches better than the "baggage" of virtue;

This brilliant remark we would apply to our present subject—the Christian Dispensation, and to all its assailants. Such is wealth to Christian virtue; whether it be in the knowledge or science of the subject, or in the operation, action, or practice of it. "Riches are as a stronghold in the *imagination* of the rich man," saith Solomon: but they are a sure let and hindrance to the Christian Pilgrim on his passage through life.

This was some time a paradox, but now the times give it proof.

It is in the DISTRIBUTION *of Wealth, that Mammon, the evil genius of our world, the great Antagonist of God, Antichrist, now reigns.*

It follows, from the preceding observations, that the Distribution of wealth must be placed on an entirely different system; the Distribution of wealth must be wrested out of the hands of Mammon. In one word, wealth must be employed and distributed according to the principles of the Christian Dispensation, the precepts of our Divine Lord and Master, or the body politic will never be healed of its diseases, the country will never cease to be cursed with its miseries and crimes.

---

the Roman word is better, *impedimenta*; for, as the baggage is to an army, so are riches to virtue. It cannot be spared or left behind, but it hindereth the march; yea, and the care of it sometimes loseth or disturbeth the victory."—*Lord Bacon's Essay on Riches.*

To the inquiries, therefore, what do you want?—what do you require?—what do you propose?—we can give an immediate and decisive reply. We require and propose, that there should be a distribution of the bounties of Providence more equal than that which now obtains—a distribution such as would prevail if the precepts of Christianity were made obligatory upon us all. In one word, we want the Christian Dispensation in lieu of that Mammonian system on which our laws and institutions all are founded.

It may be said that such a demand leads to anarchy, to confusion, to insubordination. Our answer is, that we care for no consequences—we are afraid of no results, so that Christian principles are made more and more to prevail. And whatever may follow, we are assured that the prevalence of Christian principles will secure the prevalence of benevolence, mercy, and peace.

The man, then, who will suffer the light of Christianity to shine on his politics, will have no difficulty in finding whence originates all the toil and turmoil, the crime and the prostitution, he sees in every direction around him; whereas the man who is wedded to things as they are, on whose tongue the word "No surrender" ever sits, and whose heart is under the influence of a principle of self-love, will never know how the world is to be regenerated and redeemed by the Gospel. It will be just the same with the highest prelate, his Grace the Archbishop, as with the earliest neophyte in our schools of learning; all that the little soph or the senior wran-

gler; all that the master of arts or the doctor of divinity; all that the venerable and most venerable, the right reverend and the most gracious divine, will otherwise either learn or inculcate, amounts to plausible delusion and self-deceit. The God of this world has the ascendancy in all these things; and one of his properties we again affirm is, that he can fascinate and enchant the human race, as well as tempt and deceive.

As an instance of this enchantment, we refer to the prodigious delusion that lurks under the phrase, "GIVING AWAY IN CHARITY!" Why, that heart must be exceedingly depraved which knows nothing of the sentiment that it is more "blessed"—we mean more gratifying—"to give than to receive." There is a previous question here to be answered. Has a man a right to give away in charity that of which he has despoiled his neighbour? If it be true that they, our Sir Robert Peels, *i. e.* our race of landlords and factory owners, have reduced the value of manual labour far below the point at which the laws of God have set it—and this, too, for their own especial aggrandizement—what merit have they in giving away largely in charity? They reduce by their covetousness their neighbours to distress, and then they dole out their charitable donations to them in their misery. Such conduct has passed for virtue and benevolence; but the bubble has broken, and the rising generation are becoming too intelligent not to perceive the speciousness of the delusion.

But the question is naturally suggested by the prece-

ding statements, *By what rule should the Christian, as such, distribute the wealth which may be placed at his disposal?* In other words, what is the rich Christian to do with his property? Our answer to this question is, "To the *Law* and the *Testimony*."

It is always a happy thing for frail, fallen, peccant man, that there is a perfect law, an infallible testimony, to which he may resort under every possible doubt, difficulty, and danger. What the rudder is to the noble barque, what reason is to the intelligent man, such is the law and the testimony to the real Christian.

The law and the testimony of our ancestors, the wisdom, the customs, and the maxims of the world as it goes, give but one response to our question. The wise and prudent man considers, with the Lord Bishop of London, that his wealth is a gift from above, which it is his duty highly to value and carefully to *deposit*. Is this law and this testimony in harmony with, or in contrast to, the law and the testimony of the Gospel? It is the Christian reader that is now appealed to. The times have gone by for clever and prosperous men to make a smooth and plausible composition of these conflicting elements. Can you find, Christian reader, any one point or passage in your Master's gospel, which countenances doubt or even ambiguity upon the question? If you can, bring it forth, and set it in juxta-position, in contra-position, with those direct precepts, those lucid parables, those positive instructions, that perfect example of human life and conduct, to which

your attention has been drawn in the foregoing pages.*

---

* As a fine specimen of close reasoning, lucid and comprehensive views, we solicit attention to the following extract from a Lecture which, not long since, has wafted its way across the Atlantic :—

"A great deal is said about the kinds of faith, but without much meaning. True confidence in the Lord's special promises depends on confidence in God's general character. There are only two principles on which any government, human or divine, is obeyed, fear and confidence. No matter whether it is the government of a family, or a ship, or a nation, or a universe. All obedience springs from one of these two principles. In the one case, individuals obey from hope of reward and fear of the penalty. In the other, from that confidence in the character of the government, which works by love. One child obeys his parent from confidence in his parent. He has faith which works by love. The other yields an outward obedience from hope and fear. The true convert has this faith, or confidence in God, that leads him to obey God because he loves God. This is the obedience of faith. He has that confidence in God, that he submits himself wholly into the hands of God.

"The other has only a partial faith, and only a partial submission. The devil has a partial faith. He believes and trembles. A person may believe that Christ came to save sinners, and on that ground may submit to him, to be saved ; while he does not submit wholly to him, to be governed and disposed of. His submission is only on condition that he shall be saved. It is never with that unreserved confidence in God's whole character, that leads him to say, 'Thy will be done.' He only submits to be saved. His religion is the religion of law. The other is gospel religion. One is selfish, the other benevolent. Here lies the true difference between the two classes. The religion of one is outward and hypocritical. The other is that of the heart, holy and acceptable to God.

"I will only mention one difference more. If your religion is

You may say that, as a good citizen, a good subject, a prudent and provident member of society, it is your duty to foster and fructify as much as you can, the pro-

---

selfish, you will rejoice particularly in the conversion of sinners, where your own agency is concerned in it, but will have very little satisfaction in it, where it is through the agency of others. The selfish person rejoices when he is active and successful in converting sinners, because he thinks he shall have a great reward. But instead of delighting in it when done by others, he will be even envious. The true saint sincerely delights to have others useful, and rejoices when sinners are converted by the instrumentality of others as much as if it was his own. There are some who will take interest in a revival only so far as themselves are connected with it, while it would seem they had rather sinners should remain unconverted, than that they should be saved by the instrumentality of an evangelist or a minister of another denomination. The true spirit of a child of God is to say, 'Send, Lord, by whom thou wilt send—only let souls be saved, and thy name be glorified!'

"V. I am to answer some objections which are made against this view of the subject.

"*Objection* 1. 'Am I not to have any regard to my own happiness?'

"*Answer.* It is right to regard your own happiness according to its relative value. Put it in this scale, by the side of the glory of God and the good of the universe, and then decide, and give it the value which belongs to it. This is precisely what God does. And this is what he means, when he commands you to love your neighbour as yourself.

"And again—*You will in fact promote your own happiness, precisely in proportion as you leave it out of view.* Your happiness will be in proportion to your disinterestedness. True happiness consists mainly in the gratification of virtuous desires. There may be pleasure in gratifying desires that are selfish, but it is not real happiness. But to be virtuous, your desires must

perty to which you have attained. Your reply is admitted. But what does it amount to? It goes to this point, and there sinks again into its native obliquity.

---

be disinterested. Suppose a man sees a beggar in the street: there he sits on the curbstone, cold and hungry, without friends, and ready to perish. The man's feelings are touched, and he steps into a grocery close by, and buys him a loaf of bread. At once the countenance of the beggar lights up, and he looks unutterable gratitude. Now it is plain to be seen that the gratification of the man in the act is precisely in proportion to the singleness of his motive. If he did it purely and solely out of benevolence, his gratification is complete in the act itself. But if he did it, partly to make it known that he is a charitable and humane person, then his happiness is not complete until the deed is published to others. Suppose here is a sinner in his sins: he is truly wicked and truly wretched. Your compassion is excited, and you convert and save him. If your motives were to obtain honour among men, and to secure the favour of God, you are not completely happy until the deed is told, and perhaps put in the newspaper. But if you wished purely to save a soul from death, then as soon as you see that done, your gratification is complete, and your joy unmingled. So it is in all religious duties: your happiness is precisely in proportion as you are disinterested.

"If you aim at doing good for its own sake, then you will be happy in proportion as you do good. But if you aim directly at your own happiness, and if you do good simply as a means of securing your own happiness, you will fail. You will be like the child pursuing his own shadow; he can never overtake it, because it always keeps just so far before him. Suppose, in the case I have mentioned, you have no desire to relieve the beggar, but regard simply the applause of a certain individual. Then you will feel no pleasure at all in the relief of the beggar; but when that individual hears of it and commends it, then you are gratified. But you are not gratified in the thing itself. Or suppose you aim at the conversion of sinners; but if it is not love to sinners that leads you to do it, how can the conversion of sinners make you happy? It has no tendency to gratify the desire that prompted

It leads to this fearful, this infidel conclusion, that Jesus of Nazareth never meant that his followers should do as he bade them, that the law and the testimony of his

---

the effort. *The truth is, God has so constituted the mind of man, that it must seek the happiness of others as its end, or it cannot be happy.* Here is the true reason why all the world, seeking their own happiness, and not the happiness of others, fail of their end. It is always just so far before them. If they would leave off seeking their own happiness, and lay themselves out to do good, they would be happy.

"*Objection* 2. 'Did not Christ regard the joy set before him? And did not Moses also have respect unto the recompense of reward? And does not the Bible say we loved God because he first loved us?

"*Answer* 1. It is true that Christ despised the shame and endured the cross, and had regard to the joy set before him. But what was the joy set before him? Not his own salvation, not his own happiness, but the great good he would do in the salvation of the world. He was perfectly happy in himself. But the happiness of others was what he aimed at. This was the joy set before him. And that he obtained.

"*Answer* 2. So Moses had respect to the recompense of reward. But was that his own comfort? Far from it. The recompense of reward was the salvation of the people of Israel. What did he say? When God proposed to destroy the nation, and make of him a great nation, had Moses been selfish he would have said, 'That is right, Lord; be it unto thy servant according to thy word.' But what does he say? Why, his heart was so set on the salvation of his people, and the glory of God, that he would not think of it for a moment, but said, 'If thou wilt, forgive their sins; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book, which thou hast written.' And in another case, when God said he would destroy them, and make of Moses a greater and a mightier nation, Moses thought of God's glory, and said, 'Then the Egyptians shall hear of it, and all the nations will say, Because the Lord was not able to bring this people into the land.'

mouth are figurative only, that the Christian Dispensation is a mere Utopian scheme, a visionary tale of times that never will be.

He could not bear to think of having his own interest exalted at the expense of God's glory. It was really a greater reward, to his benevolent mind, to have God glorified, and the children of Israel saved, than any personal advantage whatever to himself could be.

"*Answer* 3. Where it is said, 'We love him because he first loved us,' the language plainly bears two interpretations; either that his love to us has provided the way for our return and the influence that brought us to love him, or that we love him for his favour shown to ourselves. That the latter is not the meaning is evident, because Jesus Christ has so expressly reprobated the principle in his sermon on the mount: 'If ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? Do not the publicans the same?' If we love God, not for his character, but for his favours to us, Jesus Christ has written us reprobate.

"*Objection* 3. 'Does not the Bible offer happiness as the reward of virtue?'

"*Answer*. The Bible speaks of happiness as the result of virtue, but nowhere declares virtue to consist in the pursuit of one's own happiness. The Bible is everywhere inconsistent with this, and represents virtue to consist in doing good to others. We can see, by the philosophy of the mind, that it must be so. If a person desires the good of others, he will be happy in proportion as he gratifies that desire. Happiness is the result of virtue, but virtue does not consist in the direct pursuit of one's own happiness, but is wholly inconsistent with it.

"*Objection* 4. 'God aims at our happiness, and shall we be more benevolent than God? Should we not be like God? May we not aim at the same thing that God aims at? Should we not be seeking the same end that God seeks?'

"*Answer*. This objection is specious, but futile and rotten.

We say that every rich Christian must regulate his conduct by the precepts or laws of the Gospel; those precepts and laws which we have so roughly handled

---

God is benevolent to others. He aims at the happiness of others, and at our happiness. And to be like him, we must aim at, that is, delight in his happiness and glory, and the honour and glory of the universe, according to their real value.

"*Objection* 5. 'Why does the Bible appeal continually to the hopes and fears of men, if a regard to our own happiness is not a proper motive to action?'

"*Answer*. The Bible appeals to the constitutional susceptibilities of men, not to their selfishness. Man dreads harm, and it is not wrong to avoid it. We may have a due regard to our own happiness, according to its value.

"*Answer* 2. And again; mankind are so besotted with sin, that God cannot get their attention to consider his true character, and the reasons for loving him, unless he appeals to their hopes and fears. But when they are awakened, then he presents the gospel to them. When a minister has preached the terrors of the Lord till he has got his hearers alarmed and aroused, so that they will give attention, he has gone far enough in that line; and then he ought to spread out all the character of God before them, to engage their hearts to love him for his own excellence.

"*Objection* 6. 'Do not the inspired writers say, Repent, and believe the gospel, and you shall be saved?'

"*Answer*. Yes; but they require 'true' repentance; that is, to forsake sin because it is hateful in itself. It is not true repentance to forsake sin on condition of pardon, or to say, 'I will be sorry for my sins, if you will forgive me.' So they require true faith, and true submission; not conditional faith, or partial submission. This is what the Bible insists on. It says he shall be saved, but it must be disinterested repentance, and disinterested submission.

in the former portions of this work. There is the prohibition of Christ, "Lay not up;" there is the precept of Christ, "Give;" there is the example of Christ, the abandonment of riches for the benefit of others; there is the principle given by the Apostle of Christ, "Let every man seek not his own, but another's wealth."

The maxims and policy of the world are equally plain—"Amass, Invest, Increase, Secure!" this is the outcry of the world. It is manifest that these principles lead to courses of action diametrically opposite one to the other; that they admit of neither compromise nor mistake; the only question, if it be a question at all, being, which of the two ways will the true and faithful Christian pursue?

We know the assertion is made that indiscriminate

"*Objection* 7. 'Does not the gospel hold out pardon as a motive to submission?'

"*Answer*. This depends on the sense in which you use the term MOTIVE. If you mean that God spreads out before men his whole character, and the whole truth of the case, as reasons to engage the sinner's love and repentance, I say, Yes; his compassion, and willingness to pardon, are reasons for loving God, because they are a part of his glorious excellence, which we are bound to love. But if you mean by 'motive' a condition, and that the sinner is to repent on condition he shall be pardoned, then I say, that the Bible nowhere holds out any such view of the matter. It never authorises a sinner to say, 'I will repent IF you will forgive,' and nowhere offers a pardon as a motive to repentance, in such a sense as this."—*Lectures to Professing Christians, C. G. Finney, Lect. XII. pp.* 142-3-4-5.

giving away can never be intended by our Lord as obligatory upon us Christians of the present era. It is said that no sooner can any rich man commence the practice, than he himself must immediately sink into a state of poverty and destitution. Is this required of any one? It is a martyrdom to the world. What is to be done?

This is precisely the dilemma in which every sincere and sound professor of the Christian faith must find himself. We see what the consequence here will be; the man of obedience immediately puts himself out of that sphere of life in which he was born, and for such a sacrifice he has only done a temporary fleeting good to those who have received his property.

Viewed through a Mammonian medium, nothing can be more wild and visionary than such a doctrine. But we must take another test of truth before we can fairly dispose of the subject. Is this giving and lending, this non-investment and form of poverty, all actually and positively enjoined upon us as Christians? That is the question. It is not what the world demands of us—what policy or precedent, or self-love dictate. No! If these and Christian duties are utterly and essentially incongruous and incompatible, the question is, what should the Christian do? Both these masters, God under the Christian Dispensation, and Mammon the God of the World—both these masters no man can serve—just as no soldier can fight in the ranks of two opposing squadrons. The question is then, which of

these masters is to be obeyed? In other words, are the precepts of Christ now authoritative, or are they not? If they are, there must be an end of the dispute among Christians.

The following observations, in a quarterly publication,* are directly applicable to our purpose. "The word of God says, "Give to every man that asketh of thee." "Cast thy bread upon the waters." Man's wisdom says, "Give nothing without inquiry;" "all indiscriminate alms-giving is an injury and a crime;" "the greater part of the money given in charity does more harm than good;" "the far greater number of cases are of impostors, and of those who are really distressed, the greater part are made beggars by getting assistance; they are made idle; whereas the proper way is to force them to depend upon themselves, and convince them that they have no other resources." One set of persons say, "I have been so often imposed upon that I will never give again." Another set say, "I have seen so much harm done by charity, that I believe no charity at all would be better than the present system;" and this, though the whole amount given is so very small in comparison with what it ought to be!

"But the word of God says, 'Do good and give, hoping for nothing again.' Not that there will be no

* The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review, July, 1840, p. 240.

fruit, for the word of God has said again, 'Cast thy bread upon the waters, and thou shalt find it after many days.' That is to say, Bestow thine alms and disperse thy charity where there is, to human foresight, no prospect of fruit. But the harvest and the fruit will come, and man cannot prevent it any more than he can foresee it; it may not be in the first month, or in the first season; but ultimately it will show itself, and ripen into abundant blessings both to the giver and the receiver.

"But what has a man to do with fruits? The command is express, and this ought to be enough for believers in revealed truth. But there is no such belief.

"There is fruit, however; for the promises are as express as the commands; and those can perceive them plainly enough, who already believe God's words implicitly, and act according to that belief; and only welcome these evidences as confirmations of this belief, not as the foundations of it.

"But worldly wisdom cannot see these effects; it sees only everything that is opposite. This is only one of the many political principles entailing a deep and heavy curse upon us in consequence of the conclusions of human reasoning being put in competition with the maxims of revealed truth, which are bringing us rapidly to our fall. Every principle of government is essentially heathen; every approved maxim of life is worldly; in the meantime society is corrupted, disorganized, ready to rot and crumble to pieces; and yet no remedy can be

approved or devised for recovering the world from its disease, bordering upon dissolution, except a completer development of the same principles which have brought it to this crisis. The poor are entirely separated from the rich; they are become two distinct and opposite classes, and these opposing forces are at declared and open war; a war which promises success to the poorer party, and threatens property with pillage, and law with subversion. Yet the mischief is supposed to be, that the system under which these evils have arisen, has not been sufficiently carried out; and the remedy is supposed to be, to carry them still further. Luxury is excused, defended, justified, applauded, because it promotes employment for the poor; yet with every increase of luxury and wealth, the poor become continually poorer. The accumulation of riches is the first political virtue, the statesman's sunshine and *summum bonum;* yet with every heaping up of riches, the number of the poor increases in proportion, and so does the depth of their misery . . . . . Let us give up at once the conclusions of worldly wisdom and the products of scientific calculations, seeing their results and their signal failure, and let us look with faith to the revealed word of God, and examine with confidence what he has said, and those have said respecting alms-giving who have been rich in heavenly wisdom. Let us listen to the word of truth."

Yes, Christian reader, this is the only mode of procedure allowed to us; and if we adopt it, we cannot avoid the conclusion to which we have advanced. "I give no

alms," said Sir Thomas Brown,* "to satisfy the hunger of my brother, but to fulfil and accomplish the will and command of my God; I draw not my purse for his sake that demands it, but his that enjoined it: I relieve no man upon the rhetoric of his miseries, nor to content mine own commiserating disposition; for this is still but moral charity, and an act that oweth more to passion than reason."

O, if, as Christians, we could but determine to follow the example of our Divine Teacher, and rid ourselves as he did of all selfish indulgences, how would the whole face of nature be changed!—Mammon deposed, and every man seeking his neighbour's, not his own, gain!—SELF abased—abased?—aye *immolated*—immolated, upon the altar of Benevolence!

Every worldly man, and every speculative Christian, it is true, will immediately perceive a lion in the way.

"*Have I not a right to do what I will with my own?*"

This will be the outcry of some, and this is an excellent text for us to reason upon. Our answer to the question is this: Most undoubtedly every rich man has a well-defined and absolute right to do what he will with his own, as well under the laws made for the protection of property, as both by the letter and spirit of all

* Religio Medici, P. 1. iii. 1.

our mercenary Mammonian institutions. And this concession we gladly make, because it brings out the very question upon which we and our opponents are at issue. We ask, whether the man of a refined and regenerate humanity, whether the enlightened, the grateful, the faithful Christian, has this right to do what he will with his own? Can such a man ever forget the inspired declaration addressed to all Christians, "Ye are not your own?" Can such a man be insensible to the momentous apostolical principle, "No man liveth to himself?" Can such a man indulge himself in luxury and enjoyment, when hundreds and thousands of his fellow-creatures are languishing in pining destitution at his very door? Can such a man as this, we say, when he considers the fundamental principles of his faith, when he remembers the spirit he has imbibed from his Master, when he turns to the cross of his Saviour, can such a man as this, we say, *dare* to assert, nay, must he not with all his energy and all his soul repudiate the assertion, that he has a right to do what he will with his own?

Christianity may be all a delusion, a cunningly-devised fable, a system foisted upon the credulity—credulity did we say? aye, upon the brightest intellect of man in his brightest days, and then all our reasoning falls to the ground. But if Christianity be true, and if it be the will of Almighty God that the lapsed, depraved, and sordid heart of the natural man shall be restored and regenerated by the light, the Spirit, and the grace of

the Christian Dispensation, then let controversy do its worst; they are at best but mongrel Christians who think that they may do as they please with their wealth, while any of their neighbours are perishing for the lack of those things over which that wealth has the supreme and exclusive control.

Such are the fundamental principles of all our fiscal enactments, such are the laws of the land made by the rich for the protection of property, such are the laws of the land made by the rich for the government of the poor, that every rich man has a constitutional right to do what he will with his own; he has an absolute right to retain all he has to himself. But by what agency does he obtain this right? Mammon, Satan, the great adversary of man, the rebellious and cast-down angel, who by a mysterious dispensation of Almighty God is permitted to tempt and to torment our degraded race—Satan, who asserted to our Lord himself his power to dispose of the kingdoms of the world and their glory—Satan endows the rich man with his right. But Christ, the Son of God, who came down from heaven for the express purpose of destroying the works of the Devil, has, in the principles and precepts of his New Dispensation, utterly abolished the semblance of any such assumed prerogative; so that it is impossible, we say IMPOSSIBLE, for any man to be sincerely his follower, to be truly a believer in his name, who either openly avows or secretly acts upon the spirit of the assertion, "I have a right to do what I will with my own."

An immensely rich Duke may persist in his assertion, and may again adopt the exclamation upon which we have commented. "No!" we say to him; "that which thou callest thine own belongeth to others. Thou and thine ancestors have deprived the industrious labourer, his wife and children, of their natural rights. Ye have degraded and depraved the whole race. The spoil of the poor is in your houses. Ye have broken the people in pieces, and ground the face of the poor. 'Behold the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton. Ye have nourished your hearts as in the day of slaughter.' The laws of nature, the laws of Almighty God, the laws of the Christian Dispensation, have all been sacrificed for your aggrandizement, and for the debasement of the poor."

It will, we are aware, be asserted, that it is a preposterous imagination to suppose that any community of mankind can ever be knit and incorporated together by a system of laws over which Mammon, now the god of this world, should not have any ascendancy whatever. And this objection will be founded upon the supposition, that our principles must conduct us to *an entire community of goods* among men, in fact, to the establishment of an *entire equality*.

We deny the charge! We aver that our apothegm does NOT involve the idea of an equality of goods among

mankind. No such thing. The imputation is the invention of the enemy. We do, indeed, most strenuously deprecate that monstrous inequality which prevails, seeing (we have again and again alluded to the fact) that some thousands are overwhelmed in the immensity of their wealth, while many thousands languish in penury and want; this monstrous inequality we do fearlessly deprecate and condemn. We would plead for inequality and due subordination; that is, for that inequality, and that principle of subordination, which the END and the WILL of ALMIGHTY GOD, as revealed, written, and uttered in the Holy Bible, have unfolded.

Our position is, that the labourer, according to the letter and the spirit of the laws of the Bible, is entitled to a competency; that is, to as much of the produce of his labour as will support, and adequately support, a home, a wife, and children. This, his natural and heaven-born inheritance, in the first instance, he is entitled to receive just as the ox which treadeth out the corn is entitled to work unmuzzled — entitled thereto before the owner of the land, or of the material on which he labours, shall begin to count his gains. And this right of the labourer is more sacred, more ancient, more irrefragable than the rights of kings and princes. The scriptural principle, the verdict of wisdom and of God, relative to the rights of the industrious, is, "THOU SHALT EAT THE LABOUR OF THINE HANDS, happy shalt thou be." The rights of the upper and wealthy classes grow out of laws which they themselves have

made, but the rights of the labourer spring out of, and rest upon, the revealed will and proclaimed word of the Lord God. And we must add, that the state of degradation in which this most important class of our fellow-citizens is placed, is contrary to the laws of nature and providence; that it is offensive to right reason and obvious justice; and also that it has become so crying an evil, that some effectual remedy, some radical redress, must be provided.

Whence is this remedial process to proceed? Mammon, it is evident, will never allow the rich and the mighty, who have so long been revelling in the wealth of which the labourer has been defrauded, to prescribe any new laws, or voluntarily to surrender the booty which has descended as their heir-loom or patrimonial inheritance. It is not in the nature of things to be expected that they should. The question then returns,—How shall the productive members of human society assert and vindicate their rights, their natural rights, their heaven-born rights, their God-bestowed rights, the rights of themselves, their wives, their daughters, their sons?

Our reply is immediate and decisive. We say, argument, *not arms;* fair intelligible argument; the press, the pulpit, the rostrum, the high road, the open field—any field except the field of blood.* The call to arms,

* "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."—*The Fiat of Jehovah.*

which has recently been addressed to the labouring classes, is not only calculated to prejudice and retard, instead of to serve and advance, the recovery of their rights, but it is directly and diametrically opposed to Christian precept and Christian example. That precept and that example lead to peaceful endurance, not to violent vindication. "Put up thy sword," said our Lord to his disciple, "all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." And it was the affirmation of his great Apostle, "Though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." It is neither by fraud nor by violence, by political cunning nor force of arms, by stratagems nor proceedings which the God of heaven denounces, that the cause of the industrious poor is to be gained. This we say to the operative classes—"Do not fight, nor prepare for fight; but employ the pen and the press to the utmost of your powers. Unfold the Cross for your standard, and take the Gospel of your Redeemer for your charter. This is the way to vindicate your invaded rights. This is the way to plead in the cause of God and of his Gospel. This is the way to depose that subtle being, who is now so rampant on the earth as Antichrist, the Antagonist of the Redeemer. Spill as much ink as you like, but shed not one drop of blood." These four monosyllables, "WE WANT OUR OWN," so carried to the foot of the throne, laid on the threshold of the church, posted near the palaces of your bishops, forced upon the view of the nobility and sqirearchy of the land,

must be heard, and thus the maxim shall be realized, VOX POPULI, VOX DEI.

Christianity is a humanizing system. Its object is to make men sympathize with one another, and bear each other's burdens. But how little is this object practically recognised in this Mammon-ridden world! The God of Nature, of Revelation, of Christianity, has given to the honest and industrious a right to the adequate reward of their labour—a right paramount to that which any crowned or coroneted head can show. But the whole aristocracy of wealth have confederated together against this right; and in direct opposition to it, the rich, the royal, the noble, the powerful, and the privileged of the earth, stand in battle array.

Take an instance of this in *the Poor Law Amendment Act.* The Mammonian cajolery is hardly in anything more palpable than in this notable expedient of modern legislation. It is in itself a gross delusion, a palpable fraud, a premeditated lie; and it is so in its very title (as most titles are) and in all its tendencies and provisions.

It is called an *Amendment of the Old Poor Laws* heretofore existing; whereas it is, in fact, an *abrogation* of those old laws, and the substitution of new ones.

According to the principle, and according to the provisions of the laws thus annihilated, every inhabitant of this country was born with an indisputable right to so

much of the property of the country as was necessary for his support, whenever poverty unavoidably assailed him. That there might have been, in so humane and merciful a provision as this, a vice that might prove dangerous to the Mammonian institutions of the realm,* we are by no means disposed to deny; but, on the contrary, we admit that the Scripture proverb, "The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel," may here apply. We speak now of facts and deeds, and so premise that the New Poor Laws are not that which they affect to be, amendments of the old.

Let it also be said, on what principles are these new Poor Laws enacted? The first is, for the better protection and security of the property of the rich;† the second is, for the working a more rigid and economical system of providing for the poor.‡

And then, let any man in whom the common sympathies of nature have not merged in selfishness, look to the effects which these *Mammonian amendments* to our statutes are daily producing. Let him go to the new-planned workhouses, and see how his fellow-creatures,

---

* Lord Brougham's opinion.

† This first great object of all legislation, according to the recorded opinions of our first great Conservatives.

‡ Lord Brougham lately in the House of Lords coined a word which is remarkably illustrative of the particular character of modern times. He spoke not of the Aristocracy, nor of the Democracy, but of the Capitalocracy;—and there, as usual, he hit the right nail on the head.

how husbands, and parents, and children, are disposed of there; and then let him characterize for himself the tender mercies of these amendments to the law. Or let him listen to the verdicts of juries upon the inquests of sudden death which daily disgrace our journals, infanticides, suicides, perishing from destitution, attributable to the tender mercies of the New Poor Laws.

We do not call the rich man, as such, to look at these things and count his gains—but the Christian, as such—let him say whether it is not cajolery, sophistry, sorcery all!

Glorious age! Stupendous consummation of human wisdom and Mammon's might! O what a foolish, visionary thing is Christianity, that it should presume to meddle with such laws, and systems, and institutions as these! O Baal, hear us! Thou art our god! We prostrate ourselves at thy feet!

> "This way *duty* calls:
> That way madness lies!"

And see now, Christian reader, what a marvellous phenomenon these new lights on poverty-management offer to every beholder. What other cause could have shown you, in the House of Lords, his Grace the Duke of Wellington, and the noble and learned Lord Brougham, reciprocating plaudits upon each other? What other cause could bring the right honourable baronet, Sir Robert Peel, and Mr Joseph Hume, in the

House of Commons, into so much harmony and concurrence? What but the magic of wealth could reconcile his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his dignified reverence Sidney Smith, the prebendary?*

To be sure, this is all consistent, and quite in character. The suppression of poverty, relief to the destitute, comfort for the afflicted, or enlightenment to the ignorant, the fear of God and keeping his commandments, the love of our neighbour though not so rich as ourselves, the advancement of the Christian Dispensation on the earth and in our times,—these, and all rude ends and objects such as these, are of secondary consideration, or worse, unworthy of a thought, until the wealth of the world is made fast in the hands of those who happen to have got possession of it. Have we wronged our illustrious, noble, and right honourable legislators, when we say of them, that wise as they are above all others in their generation of Mammonism, yet, as Christians, they walk in utter darkness?

And yet it is supposed that we live in an age of reform. We are under the government of a party in the state, who years ago ousted their predecessors, because they were too conservative of our ancient laws

* A notable instance of such *reconciliation* is recorded in the Gospels. There we read of PILATE the Governor, and HEROD the Tetrarch, hitherto bitter opponents, being "made friends together," by having one common enemy to oppose.—Luke xxiii, 12.

and institutions. And so the new ministers set themselves to the work of reform and amelioration. We must not stop to ask them—what have ye done? It is enough to assert, that, as in the notable case of the Poor Law Amendment Act, to which we have just adverted, they neither know themselves, nor understand the subjects upon which they have, with so much bungling, attempted to legislate.

Is it literally, and radically, and morally true, that the Christian is the highest style of man? Is the Christian Dispensation from heaven—a Dispensation of regeneration and redemption for degenerate and fallen man, and this for time as well as for eternity? Is it designed by Almighty God, that the spirit, the laws, the fundamental principles and essence of this Dispensation, shall gradually supersede, and eventually absorb and annihilate, all the old, depraved, and degenerate systems? Is this the great desideratum which our world, as a world, so long has waited for? And is the fact quite clear, that our reformers know little, and care little about any of these things?

Christian reader! see you not what a silly, wicked farce this is which we, the common people, are made to witness? To witness?—ay, and to pay for too. Is it for this, that, as we have just seen, the hire of the labourer is fraudulently withheld? Is it for this that we have doctors of divinity, and blue-stocking ladies, and government scribes, to give us check-population essays, and means whereby the new-born infant of the poor

man should be stifled at its birth?* Talk of this being an age of reform indeed! There never were times when, in a civilized country like this, the doctrine of a redundant population was publicly avowed— charging the great Creator with making too many human souls to do him service; never, till now, was the protection of property allowed to be the great object of legislation; never, till now, were the laws for the depression of the labourer, and for the government of the poor, half so stringent and cruel; never was there a time when propositions were broached to prevent the increasing numbers of the poor, half so iniquitous, so inhuman, so brutal; never was there a time when a more Anti-christian spirit pervaded and directed the formation, the mode, and the administration of our legislative system.

In conclusion, on this part of our subject, every sound Christian will perceive, that the question which a professing public has now to dispose of, is very different from that which has so often been pressed upon us. It is not mere matter of faith on one hand, and unbelief on the other—but this—

ARE THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION SUCH AS WISE LEGISLATORS ARE BOUND TO BUILD UPON?

This is the question. The answer which our fathers have given in this inquiry will not now suffice. It is of

* Every third child of a poor couple is to be stifled at its birth, according to Marcus.

no use now to say, that the laws of the realm are founded upon the laws of God: it is of no use now to say, that Christianity is part and parcel of the laws of the land. We affirm that the laws of the land ought to be subordinated to the principles of Christianity: and that they ought to be instituted, and modified, and applied, according to the rules of that Dispensation which contains all needful provisions for the life that now is, as well as for salvation in that which is to come.

In short, the time has come for all that is merely speculative, or occult, or spiritual, or theological, in those who teach and preach, to be brought to the test of action and practice. The time has come for the great Antagonist of the Christian Dispensation to be revealed and developed to every man of faith. The time has come when the great delusion must be dissipated. The time has come when the monstrous anomaly must no longer be presented, of a country where more is done than by any other people in the world for the propagation and profession of the Gospel—and yet where Antichrist is so manifestly, so despotically, and so universally ascendant.

We then have our answer to give to the question which has recently been put forth with so much eloquence in the public prints.—What can England do? Our answer is—

EVANGELIZE THE PEOPLE, AND DENOUNCE THE DESPOT MAMMON.

And now, in closing these remarks, turn to the representations, Christian reader, which the preceding pages contain, and stedfastly compare, or rather contrast, the Christianity of the world with the Christianity delineated in the New Testament. Here is the Christianity of the world made of all sorts of stuffs, shreds, and patches, evasions and delusions, spiritual and carnal. The saints and the sages, as well as the sceptics, say, that the Redeemer could not have meant that his precepts should be taken in a literal sense; that his words must be distorted, adapted, wrested from their proper construction; and that natural ideas must be modified and changed. And why? because the existing order of things would be dislocated, the present state of society disturbed, the peace of a slumbering world broken in upon: some such frivolous pretence as this is adduced, and therefore the Redeemer's commands are to be disobeyed, and his plain declarations are to be misinterpreted.

Wretched combination of impiety, fanaticism, and folly! What is this but to introduce doubts, and inconsistency, and imperfection, into the whole extent of the evangelical records?

For if one declaration is not to be literally understood, another and another may be treated in the same manner, until all the foundations of Christian faith, and hope, and obedience, are subverted and destroyed. What! are the words of that divine Master, who "spake as never man spake," to be treated with such audacious indecency and profanity as this?

It is upon the common principle, that none are so blind as those who will not see; it is upon the supposition that the saints and sages of our times are infatuated by a dire and a deep delusion as to the person of the Man of Sin, so as actually to believe a lie touching the Antagonist of the Christian Dispensation—that we would presume to lift up our voice from the multitude, and imagine that it is competent for a mere "hewer of wood and drawer of water," to instruct his betters upon so momentous, so sacred, so magnificent a subject.

This is the sum and substance of our case: who shall refute it? who shall refuse to give it his most serious consideration? Mammon is Antichrist—Mammon, the god of wealth—Mammon, the god of the world—Mammon, the prince of the power of the air—Mammon, the master-spirit and ruling genius of all our national institutions—he is the Antagonist—the actual, personal, potential, revealed, denounced Antagonist of Almighty God under the Christian Dispensation—to us, our age and nation—to us, our homes and altars—to the throne, to the nobles, to the gentry, to the common people of our times.

This is a plain saying, and defies the most subtle sophistication: Is it true or is it false? Jesus of Nazareth says it is true. The spirit, the letter, the law of the Christian Dispensation, say it is true. The fact is written, as it were, by the point of a sunbeam upon every page of the Gospel history.

Who says it is false? The Church says it is false; The State says it is false; all the rich and influential say it is false.

But what say you, common sense Christian reader? Have you "so learned Christ," and the nature of that Dispensation which that divine person came from heaven to plant on the earth? Are we, or are the rich and influential, under the ban of this delusion? With which party is the TRUTH? Is it to us or to our opponents that the description is applicable, "The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not?" Is it to us or to them that the exclamation may be pointed—"If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness?"

Thus, upon the Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth we have taken our stand, and we hope to abide the issue in life and in death.

SECTION IX.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

I.

It is affirmed that our principles interfere "with vested interests—with the sacred nature of property."

Although it may appear to our readers a digression, we shall, in answer to this objection, take the Lord Bishop of London on his own premises, anxiously desiring not to scandalize any one, especially so superior a character. But who shall deliver his lordship from the dilemma in which he has placed himself?

First, as to the dreadful and disgraceful spiritual destitution which prevails in this metropolis, his lordship's own diocese. He writes thus:—

"I am continually brought into contact, in the discharge of my official duties, with vast masses of my fellow-creatures living without God in the world. I traverse the streets of this crowded city with deep and solemn thoughts of the spiritual condition of its inhabitants. I pass the magnificent church which crowns the metropolis, and is consecrated to the noblest

of objects—the glory of God, and I ask of myself, in what degree it answers that object? I see there a dean and three residentiaries, with incomes amounting in the aggregate to between 10,000*l.* and 12,000*l.* a year: I see, too, connected with the Cathedral, twenty-nine clergymen, whose offices are all but sinecures, with an annual income of about 12,000*l.* at the present moment, and likely to be much larger after the lapse of a few years. I proceed a mile or two to the east and north-east, and find myself in the midst of an immense population in the most wretched state of destitution and neglect — artisans, mechanics, labourers, beggars, thieves, to the number of at least 300,000."

Secondly, we have it conceded by his lordship, and by his colleague, his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, that one-half of the emoluments of each of the sacred offices which their lordships hold in the church will be amply sufficient to maintain the dignities thereof. And then, as delegated Commissioners of Church Reform, they proceed to prepare, propound, and publish an Act of Parliament, which is to limit the income of every future Archbishop of Canterbury, and every future Bishop of London, to such moiety of revenue, giving the other moiety to a fund, now accumulating, for the supply of the spiritual destitution which it is discovered so dreadfully prevails.

Our question is, how such an arrangement is to be reconciled to reason, to common sense, and to pro-

priety? And the answer given is, that to take away the moiety above spoken of *now*, or any part of it, from the present possessors, would be to commit an act of spoliation, confiscation, and so forth — it would be to trespass upon the sacred nature of property. So, then, the three hundred thousand perishing souls, in a part only of that very city in which these exalted church dignitaries reside, are to remain, in a great degree, in their present miserable state of spiritual destitution, rather than that this figment—the sacred nature of property—should be invaded!

The old-fashioned plea by which rich incumbents used to justify their exactions from their poor parishioners, is now given to the winds. The constant apology of all was, that each one held his benefice in trust, and that he was bound in honour and duty to leave it to his successor just as good and as productive as he found it. And this they would plead on the self-same principle—the sacred nature of property.

Now to the moral of all this. Our diocesan calls upon us, each and all, to make some immediate sacrifice of our limited earnings, and to contribute as much as we can to the fund now being raised for the purpose of delivering perishing souls from eternal perdition, and to supply spiritual food to so many hundreds of thousands of our neighbours now entirely destitute. To this call some voice has replied, "The Church possesses ample revenues within herself for all these purposes, but the holders of these revenues

misapply them;" and this leads to inquiry; inquiry brings out an acknowledgment of the fact, that the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury has wasted 15,000*l.* a-year, and that the episcopal see of London has spent 10,000*l.* per annum in superfluous things. And it is ordained by statute that hereafter — *i. e.* when these two exalted dignitaries shall be gathered to their fathers — then this superfluous 25,000*l.* per annum shall enrich the required fund!

Christian reader, again we ask, say we not well when we call Mammon a sorcerer? The prejudices of education, the effects of habit, mere human frailty, or the grossest self-love—none of these considerations adequately account for the arguments by which our opponents thus uphold their axiom as to the sacred nature of property. It is the witchery of Satanic possession.

This delusion—the sacred nature of property — is not confined to private opinion or to private life; it pervades the state. We have a remarkable proof of this in the twenty millions sterling of compensation money which the government of the country has given to the slave holders, as an inducement to them to relinquish their slave property. Compensation truly! Recompence and remuneration for giving up a property which they obtained and held by a violation of the word and will of the Lord Jehovah! Again, say we not well, that the god of wealth is a sorcerer—one who bewitches and fascinates those who yield to his

seductive advances? Reader! the time has come for this murky delusion to vanish; the light of the Christian Dispensation is already bright enough to dispel the mists of former days.

And yet these great truths are not to be told. And why? Wherefore is it that these matters of fact—matters of fact which are rooted data of the Christian Dispensation on the earth—are to be suppressed and hushed? Is it so because the existing constitution of things amongst us is so good and so happy that it must not be disturbed in its sweet repose? or is it so because the real condition of society is so bad, so depraved, and vicious, that it cannot bear the truth?

Let the reader take our apothegm in his hand, and he will hardly find a dark and dreary controversy now rife amongst us, that will not yield to its effulgence. Look, for instance, at the "four years" disputation upheld by the Rev. Sydney Smith and the Lord Bishop of our diocese respecting a new distribution of the revenues of the Church; and you will find the whole magic and mystery of the controversy fall before the fact, that Mammon, as Antichrist, reigns. Upon what other principle can we unriddle the problem (referred to above) settled upon by these exalted commissioners, that whilst they admit that one half of the immense incomes now derived from the revenues of the Church severally to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury, and the episcopal see of London, is quite adequate to maintain the state, honour, and

dignity of their appointments, yet during their lives no sacrifice is to be made—no sacrifice is to be made, although the spiritual destitution in many parts of this very diocese is so great?

Let us take, again, the long-standing controversy in the Church of Scotland—a controversy which our state leaders declare they can neither abate nor solve. You will find, Christian reader, that all the obscurity and the difficulties flee before our Mammonian light. There is nothing formidable but as to the revenues of the Church. Lord Kinnoul, the patron of Auchterarder, shall present Mr Robert Young; the law allows it, and the court adjudges it; but who shall secure the revenues to the presentee? And what is the benefice worth, if the people to whom that reverend gentleman ministers will not support the incumbent? It is a question of money; and here we find, again, that Mammon is a sorcerer.

II.

It is objected, that "the Parable of the Talents proves that riches are the gift of God to those persons who possess them."

We must again advert to the word and to the testimony, as they stand recorded upon the admitted gospel of the Redeemer. Thus, then, stands the sacred record.

"For the kingdom of Heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and

delivered unto them his goods. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey. Then he which had received the five talents, went and traded with the same, and made them other five talents. And likewise he that had received two, he also gained other two. But he that had received one, went and digged in the earth and hid his lord's money. After a long time, the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them. And so he that had received five talents, came and brought other five talents, saying unto him, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents; behold, I have gained besides them five talents more. His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord. He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents, behold, I have gained two other talents beside them. His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord. Then he which had received the one talent, came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed; and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth; lo, there thou hast that is thine. His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed;

thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury. Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents; for unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath: And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Now mark it well, Christian reader, this parable, this mode of illustration, chosen by our divine Teacher, we are now told to receive as a proof that riches are the gift of God to those who possess them. In other words, we are so to construe and apply this parable, as if it contained a plain and palpable contradiction of all those other sayings and doings of our Lord (before adverted to) wherein the condition or the position of every determinedly rich man is one of censure and reprobation. Let it then be our present aim, study, and desire, to give to the episode, or lesson, its proper and legitimate reading.

It is manifest, in the first place, that the man about to set out on a long journey is to be considered as a rich man. It is said that he called his own servants, persons in his own immediate employment, about him, and divided his goods among them in different proportions. He must also have been a shrewd and observing man, for it appears he gave to each the share which each had to deal with according to his particular ability for the improvement of those goods, say riches.

And having so done, he departed on his long journey, not again to be heard of until his final return. In the interim, the true character of the several employees is strongly tested. Among them one is found, who, instead of activity and zeal in making the most of the little share which had been committed to him, falls into a state of apathy and sloth. He had been evidently soured in his temper by the paucity of the goods which he received; and so, in this humour, he buries his talent in the earth.

Now, the question is, what proof does this parable, this argument, this illustration afford, as to the right or the wrong position of every rich man in the midst of poverty and destitution? Has the parable any legitimate bearing upon the question? If our Lord had spoken of evil things, such as poisons, swords, and daggers, instead of goods, would such an allusion prove his approbation of the use of swords, poison, and daggers? or could we hence fairly infer that such things were the gift of God?

To our reading, the main drift or chief design of this parable is, to stir up Christians to the effort and the line of duty, each one to the utmost of his ability. Our commentary would run thus—

The kingdom of heaven, the present state of that divine Dispensation which the Redeemer came to proffer and propound to the world, may be explained or illustrated by the peculiar circumstances of a man travel-

ling into a far country, and committing his goods—meaning the properties he could not take with him—to the several persons then in his employment. These goods, it appears, were not of a perishable, but were all of an improvable nature or quality, and would require care and cultivation after that the master's eye was withdrawn from them. The man, the traveller, knew the ability which each of these persons possessed to improve and benefit his goods, and so he gave to each, not that proportion which each might have asked for, but to each according to his measure or capacity.

The moral lesson which our divine Teacher intended to convey is quite plain and palpable to common sense. It is this, that whether we have the power of doing much or little towards the advancement of the Redeemer's Dispensation on the earth, that little or much should be done with assiduity, perseverance, and vigour.

Hence, we venture to conclude, that it is to wrest Scripture from its own holy meaning and purpose, in any one to insist that the Parable of the Talents proves that worldly wealth is the gift of God to those who possess and so appreciate it.

The chapter before us consists of three distinct parabolical representations, touching the spirit or science of the Christian Dispensation, as a heavenly kingdom. The first of these representations is the similitude derived from the case of the young women who were to take a prominent part in a marriage ceremony, about

to be celebrated at the midnight hour. Half of these virgins were wise and provident, the other half foolish and improvident; so that when the bridegroom came suddenly forward and awoke them from their sleep, the latter found that their burning lamps had exhausted all the oil which was to feed the light. They consequently were excluded from the wedding. This statement is closed with the moral which properly belongs to it, and about which there is no ambiguity or obliquity—"Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh."

The second of these parabolical representations is the parable before us. We have already glanced at the principal parts postulated by the Evangelist, and repeat our conviction, that the moral or lesson which our Lord intended to convey is fully embodied in the statement we have made.

The third parabolical representation set forth in the chapter, brings us all before the bar of Heaven to be arraigned at the great assize, when conduct will not only be scrutinized, but be made the pivot point, the true criterion, on which our eternal destiny will depend. And conduct us to what particular bearing? Shall we trifle or dissimulate in the point? Is it not manifest—broadly, demonstrably manifest—that it is not spirituality and sanctity of life and manners, it is not orthodoxy of doctrine or sanctimonious profession, but it is benevolence, brotherly love, which constitutes the very

and identical test and criterion which will then decide the whole matter.

What, then, can we find in the whole chapter, from its commencement to its close, which militates against the great principle which it is the object of this work to maintain?

Christian reader, are these sayings—called *parables*—of our Divine Teacher—to be perused as illustrations or as demonstrations? If by a parable we are to mean a dark and incomprehensible saying, then this is no parable, because the lesson or moral of the tale is made manifest by the narrator himself. Our objector, indeed, quotes the text—"All these things were done in parables, that seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand." But this text has nothing to do with the subject, because it refers exclusively to a particular state of obstinate and inveterate blindness and unbelief prevailing among the Jews during the ministry of the Redeemer.

All that the reader has to do is to settle with himself this momentous issue—whether he is a sincere Christian, a true believer,—or whether he is merely one of the "much people who gather together to hear" the word—one of those that are "without,"—an individual of a mass "whose heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed"—or, whether he can peruse the Gospel with child-like sim-

plicity, and resolutely determined to take it up as the development of the Redeemer's own Dispensation, and to adopt its spirit, its determinations, its requisitions, as divine.

If it be true that no man can understand the Gospel without immediate and personal inspiration from above —if it be true that special grace, that great sanctity of manners, that deep study and much learning, must precede the knowledge of Jesus Christ and of his laws, then, alas! we must recoil from our work—we are fools feigning wisdom. But if, on the other hand, we may venture to take our Divine Teacher at his word—"Verily, I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein" —why, then, we may venture to set at nought all mere human attainments, however profound, however splendid, however applauded. Our one talent shall not be wrapped in a napkin, nor deposited in the earth. We will be up and doing, and see that our lamps are well trimmed and well supplied.

We say, then, that the use which the objector makes of this portion of Gospel record, is vicious in two respects; first, it diverts the beam of light from the object on which it is designed to shine, thereby obscurating its truth; and, secondly, by giving plausibility and consequence to error, its tendency is to perpetuate the ascendancy of Mammon in our world.

III.

It is objected to us that we employ "Personalities" —and we are told to "avoid personalities, because they hinder usefulness."

This is good advice as a general rule, but adherence to such a rule in our case *would* hinder usefulness. Thus, for instance, the Lord Bishop of London deprecates the gambling propensities of the Messrs Rothschild; and will tell us that "the money gained upon the devil's back, is generally spent under his belly;" and so forth. So also the Messrs Rothschild can see through the sophistry of the Lord Bishop of London for keeping to himself twenty or thirty thousand pounds per annum, though spiritual destitution everywhere prevails, and he himself has discovered that ten thousand pounds per annum is enough for the maintenance of the dignities and duties of his holy office.

Thus, too, the Duke of Wellington may have a quick and lively sense of the horrid inhumanities practised upon poor infants in the factory system; while Sir Robert Peel may be horrified at all those who coolly and deliberately imbrue their hands in the blood of many a fellow creature.

In short, we cannot make our shafts hit the right mark—the consciences of men—but by such personalities; and so we persist in the use of them.

Thus we arraign before the tribunal of public opinion all those persons who, whether out of the plunder of the poor, or the produce of their estates, or their commercial artifices, or the earnings of the gin-palace and the pawn-shop, or superior cunning, or ecclesiastical position, keep their elegant equipages, their splendid establishments, their noble mansions—they are all infatuated Mammonists. They may think themselves the special favourites of heaven, and may quote the Bishop of London as their authority—we place them all under our ban of Mammon-ridden devotees, and challenge their denial.

IV.

It is objected to us, that we "libel and defame our betters."

Be it granted—the only questions we care about are these. First, is our libel, our defamation, true or false? —and, secondly, is such an exposure calculated to accelerate the advance of the Redeemer's Dispensation on the earth?

V.

It is objected—"You set up your opinions in direct opposition to the decisions of the Lord Bishop of London.

This is easily said; but it must be recalled by him who would hold to the truth. We do not set up *our*

opinion at all. But thus we venture to do—we set up the written *dicta* of one Jesus of Nazareth in direct opposition to the written *dicta* of the Lord Bishop of London—who is our spiritual pastor and master—upon the question—who has the ascendancy as the disposer of the wealth of the world—the Everlasting God or Satan?

We have an opinion upon the point, most undoubtedly; but the question is, whether that view of the subject has the authority, the intelligence, the revelation, and word of Jesus Christ for its basis. The Giant and the Pigmy must have recourse to the same Gospel, to the same testimony.—How READEST THOU?

Who are we, indeed, that we should presume to read a lecture to our betters? Our betters? Aye, to dispute with no less a dignitary than the Lord Bishop of London? We have already intimated that it is not worth the reader's while to stop and ask this question, aware as we nevertheless are, how sadly all our readers are given to partisanship in this our day.

We have now these few words to add to the wish already expressed that the reader would put us just in that part of the category of personal demerit which but suits his own taste. These few words are, that the more silly and insignificant we are, the more easy should the work of discomfiture be. Not us, but our work, do thou, Christian reader, if so disposed, assail.

The issue of our contest is in the hands of God; we have assumed our cause in his name; to his glory we wish all our observations and efforts to tend; and our intention in contending with Mammonism is, to hasten the arrival of the happy and glorious consummation for the intelligent universe, when God shall be all in all.

SECTION X.

REPLIES TO THE ANIMADVERSIONS OF A REVEREND FRIEND.

"For all I thank thee, most for the severe."

Our little work has been submitted to the inspection of a reverend friend, for whom we entertain equal respect and affection; and he has adduced many objections against our statements and opinions. We append the following replies, for the sake of illustrating our great principle, and of showing how futile is all the opposition of man when brought into contact with the word of God. Vituperative expressions we would avoid; but our consistent allegiance to the truth, as it is in Jesus, we must maintain, and on every occasion prove ourselves faithful in our Master's sight. We feel that we are advocating his cause, and that we are supported by his dicta, and therefore we speak with the fullest confidence of the mind.

The first stricture of our censor is on the statement

advanced at p. 4 of our book—We say "That there is an Almighty Being, the Creator and Preserver of our globe, and all which it inhabits, the Author and Giver of all good, is our first position—and that there is another being, of an opposite character, who is the author and fomentor of all evil—this is the second of the primary positions, in which both parties are agreed. The question is, which of these two antagonistic beings has now got the wealth of the world at his disposal?"

"Antagonist!" exclaims our corrector.—"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." "Thou couldst have no power against me unless it were given thee from above." "I form the light and create the darkness; I make peace and create evil: I do all these things, saith the Lord."

Antagonist of Almighty God! This is a bold and apparently an impious assumption. Natural religion revolts from it: human reason cannot grapple with it. Omnipotency thwarted in its purpose! Who presumes to advance such an incomprehensible and anomalous doctrine?

The answer is, that the Holy Bible everywhere predicates, postulates, propounds the proposition, as a certain, substantive, and solid matter of fact. The *Christian* answer is, that Jesus of Nazareth, in his gospel, has declared and descanted upon the fact, as one of the highest importance. He informs us that there are, *de*

facto, two master spirits in our world, each seeking suit and service of all men. He tells us that one of these masters is the Infinite Jehovah, God; and that the other is Satan, in the form and character of Mammon. Men who differ as to the meaning of the word Mammon, must yet allow that our postulate, or premises, as to the antagonism in question, is thus supported by the word and revelation of Jesus Christ.

It is not for us to attempt to reconcile any of those apparent discrepancies, or contradictions in terms, which may be culled from the Bible. "Lord! I believe! help thou my unbelief! We read, in words coming from thine own mouth, that there are two masters—two master spirits—in our world. Thou hast recorded the fact: it is not for dust and ashes to dissemble the truth."

The *supremacy* of the Lord God Almighty stands in no need of vindication from our hands; all that we have to contend for is the certainty that Mammon is in the *ascendant*, over our globe.

At p. 7 of our essay appears the following paragraph; "There needs but one word more to put you into full possession of the truth which it is the object of this essay to develop. That word is, MAMMON. Mammon, we submit, is Antichrist." In opposition to this statement we find adduced, 1 John, ii. 18, "Even now there are many Antichrists." And there is added the excla-

mation, "This, when it is said they had all things common."

Now if the objection intended to be conveyed by this quotation is, that there cannot be ONE great potential antagonist of the Redeemer's Dispensation, because, even in those primitive times, *many* Antichrists had appeared, we immediately reply, that such an objection is nullified by the language of the Apostle in the commencement of the verse. The whole verse is, "Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now there are many Antichrists, whereby ye may know that it is the last time." The meaning of John evidently is, It has been declared that the "man of Sin, the son of Perdition," shall be revealed; even now there are many Antichrists, many forms of hostility already existing, indicative, as it were, of the complete exhibition of the great deceiver: and by the appearance of these Antichrists it is ascertained that the predicted period is at hand. In this point of view the passage rather supports than opposes the doctrine of our book.

From the context of the passage quoted, it appears that these Antichrists were apostates—"They went out from us," says the Apostle in the next verse, "because they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out that they might be manifest that they were not all of us." They were the men who denied that Jesus was the Christ, after having professed the faith; in the em-

phatic words of St Peter, they were persons who, "through covetousness and feigned words, make merchandize of you"—they were therefore Antichrists, because they were the subjects of Mammon, the great Antichrist; they were deluded by his influence and destroyed by his power. The text quoted, therefore, we say again, is rather an argument in our favour than an objection to our cause.

The reader will find, in p. 10, the following question. "The Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth—the New Testament—the New Covenant—does it speak plainly, intelligibly, directly, conclusively to the point?" This question is met by a positive contradiction. "Certainly not," exclaims our amiable objector. In reply to this contradiction, first of all we affirm that it is a virtual libel on the Gospel of Christ to insinuate that, on so momentous a subject, its testimony is obscure, unintelligible, indirect, and inconclusive. And in the next place, we challenge the reader to peruse the fourth section of our book, and then to say if this "certainly not" is not utterly swept away by an absolutely overwhelming tide of refutation.

We have imputed, at p. 12, to each of the two great churches of Rome and England distinctly, and to the priests and prelates of each of those churches generally, Mammonian or mercenary subserviency.

The objector writes that here we are "in confusion,

from confounding sordid ministers of the church with the church itself."

We make no such confusion. It is the sordid system which makes the sordid ministers. The sordid ministers are not the exceptions to the general order of things, but the emanations which naturally proceed from the system with which they are connected. Our meaning is, that both the great churches of Christendom, and that (generally speaking) all those who live by the church, and who hope to rise in the church, are obnoxious to the charge of being subservient to Mammon, the God of wealth; not willingly, not hypocritically, not sordidly, but of necessity.

An objection is taken to the views we have stated (p. 22) of the nature of the Christian Dispensation. We speak of this Dispensation as "a system, whose elements, fundamental principles, and laws, are all *sui generis*, all divine."

The objector tells us that "These elements, &c. are not *sui generis*, but in a great measure common to the Natural and Mosaic Religions."

Greatly surprised are we that "a Master in Israel" should refer to Natural Religion to show that the Christian Dispensation, *as a system of Redemption*, is not *sui generis*. Greatly should we wish to know what association or admixture Natural Religion ever has had, or ever can have, in the development of this Redemption, which

is a matter of pure revelation. And with respect to the Mosaic Religion it is enough to remark, that it was merely intended to pave the way for the introduction of the Christian Dispensation; and that when the object of its institution was accomplished, it was abolished for ever.

At p. 26, where we have minutely analyzed our apothegm, we find three objections raised.

The first objection applies to our assertion, that the word Mammon has respect to *person*. This proposition, the opponent declares, he will not admit. But his non-admission is not disproval. His non-admission cannot subvert the immutable testimony of Jesus, when he declared, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." His non-admission by no means controverts the fact that "It is essential to the wisdom and integrity of the testimony, that *both* these antagonist masters should have the same real being; for to suppose that the first is a real existence, and the latter an unreal, fictitious creature, is at once to assail the intelligence and consistency of the Redeemer's dictum."

The second objection applies to our position as to the universal influence of wealth in all our worldly institutions. The objector avers, that "This is a mere dictum of the author." We have affirmed that "this person, Mammon, the god of wealth, is also the God of the world, the master spirit and ruling genius of all our worldly institutions, the prince of the power of the air,

inflating, infatuating, and polluting the political atmosphere which fills the court, the church, the senate, the camp, the city."

The reader is on the seat of judgment now. We appeal to his every-day experience and hourly observation. We ask him to go to the court, to inspect the church, to visit the senate, to examine the camp, to investigate the city, and then to tell us which of these human combinations is free from the influence of Mammon? Take away their revenues, and what would the best of them become? What! is *this* hasty, empty, unsupported dictum?

The third objection applies to our great principle, Mammon—Antichrist. This also is said to be the dictum of the author. Since this objection will shortly be fully answered, we pass over it for the present.

With reference to our reasonings on the real existence of Mammon (p. 26), the objector makes the remark, "No more than any other carnal passion."

The actual agency of such a being as Mammon amongst us Christians, and that in the capacity of the Antagonist of the Redeemer's Dispensation on the earth, is a particular, in our case, of so much importance, that we must defend it wherever assailed. The integrity of the position is with our Divine Teacher; it is his postulate, not ours; experience and observation

everywhere show how true it is. What similitude or analogy there is between this matter of fact and "any other carnal passion," is not for us to discover. Is it by such vague assertions as this that our reasonings are to be answered?

"Wealth is the *primum mobile* of all human transactions and affairs," we observe, p. 28.

Upon this our objector remarks, "Wealth and property are confounded. The property of the poor is as sacred as that of the rich, and more efficient as a *primum mobile.*"

"We hardly know how to admit that there is anything like either confusion of ideas or ambiguity of expression in this clause. Wealth means riches, and to the word property we add the idea of wealth in possession.

"The property of the poor as sacred as that of the rich, and more efficient as a *primum mobile!*" The writer of this remark cannot mean that the poor man's few pence are as efficient for any human purpose as are the rich man's thousands of pounds. He must, therefore, intend to say that in KIND and in degree this is the case. But this appears to us to be the wildest possible absurdity; it is tantamount to the affirmation that weakness is adequate to strength, that the infant is as powerful as the giant, that the less is equal to the greater.

The sacredness of the poor man's pence involves a

paradox which we know not how to dispose of. The poet says—

> "Poor men are born to wrongs, low are their ranks,
> The more they're trod, the more they must give thanks."*

And thus decides the sacred scripture:—"The destruction of the poor is their poverty." "The poor is hated even of his neighbour. All the brethren of the poor do hate him; how much more do his friends go far from him? he pursueth them with words and yet they are wanting to him."† "Ye have despised the poor. Do not rich men oppress you and draw you before the judgment seats?" ‡ If there be any sacredness in the poor man's pence, it is a sacredness which has been continually violated in every age and nation, and it will continue to be violated incessantly, and with comparative impunity, so long as Mammonism retains its obnoxious ascendancy in our world.

At p. 28 we adopt the exclamation, "What contempt is cast upon poverty, though it may be connected with every human virtue and excellence!" To this our objector replies,—"Say rather what *praise!*" We must candidly confess that the praise of the poor never meets us in this sordid world—or if it does, it is like the "promise which is kept to the ear but broken to the hope." To the conduct of the world towards the deserving poor, Johnson's description of a patron is strictly applicable:—"He sees a man struggling for life in the

* Dauborne's Poor Man's Comfort. † Prov. xix, 6, 7.
‡ James ii, 6.

water, and lends him no assistance; but no sooner does the sufferer get towards the shore than the patron encumbers him with his help."

When we inquire, "Who can exercise influence who is destitute of wealth?" our objector replies, "Moral influence gains accession by being unallied to wealth." Why, this is contradicted by experience and fact. We ask, is moral influence felt most from the palace or the hovel, in the rich man or in the poor? It is unnecessary to answer the question.

To make out his point our objector refers to the cases of Diogenes in ancient, and Mr Pitt in modern times. The argument, or rather the allusion, can be disposed of in a moment. Diogenes, with all his philosophy, was banished from his native country, Pontus in Asia Minor, for *coining*; and the moral influence of Pitt, both in Britain and the world, would have been wonderfully circumscribed, had not all the revenue and all the resources of the richest and most powerful nation in the universe been placed at his disposal. To us there is no light in the lanthorn of Diogenes, and but little abstract power in the prominent position of Pitt. The moral power of the last-named celebrated financier arose so exclusively from a Mammonian influence, that we might call him into court as one of our own witnesses. Unallied to wealth, what would this great man have been? Why, his whole life was dedicated to fiscal pursuits.

This is making confusion of ideas more confounded.

According to this rule of moral influence, the moral worth of the servants in the hall has a greater influence than the moral worth of the masters up stairs. They no longer imitate their superiors as it used to be of old, but all things are turned topsy turvy to accommodate our Mammonian establishments.

At p. 29 we say "Mammon a deceiver, as well as despot." Upon these words we find the following critique:—"Deceiver, not derived from deceitfulness of riches, but of the sensual appetites—'he tempted, I did eat.' The deceived and the deceiver are his.—"Job xii, 16."

We turn to this ancient book, the book of Job, and there we find not the rushlight of Diogenes, nor the brighter science of a Pitt, but we do find a light to our path and a lamp to our pen that would tell of the Omnipotency of God. Yes, "all things, the deceiver and the deceived are his. He leadeth counsellers away spoiled, and maketh the judges fools. He taketh away the heart of the chief of the people of the earth, and causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way."

But what has this quotation to do with the object of the opponent? In what possible manner can it be used to show that the sensual appetites, and not Mammon, constitute the deceiver? Why, this very book of Job, in its representations relative to the character and agency of Satan, is one of the most affecting demonstrations of

the awful but scriptural proposition, that the Lord Jehovah does tolerate, does allow, and admit of an antagonist in the globe which we inhabit. If no argument be so bad as that which proves too much, and if our objector admits, as we believe he does, the personality and power of Satan—then where is the point of his quotation or the power of his argument?

Page 30.—When we speak of the Mammonian spirit which actuates the leaders of our political factions, we repeat the words of Sir James Graham, uttered in a published speech,—"I am for the government by property, against the government by numbers," a declaration which, to our minds, is equivalent to an open avowal of that Mammonian ascendancy which we deplore.

And what, Christian reader, says our reverend opponent to this?—"So ordained by a greater than all, even God!" Thus our old question is again adverted to in bold assertion, under a diversified aspect. We have it now boldly and openly asserted, that "money ought to make the mare to go;" that one man amongst ten thousand, no matter how great his demerits, no matter how superior in moral worth each of the ten thousand may be, so long as he is the man of property among them, is to rule—"It is so ordained by a greater than all, even by God!"

What are we to do now with the assertion that moral influence gains accession by being unallied to

wealth? We cannot reconcile such apparent contradiction, but do hope in the end to elucidate the truth by the collision.

When we turn to our objector's animadversions on page 32, we have an instance of Scripture being brought to bear against Scripture—a practice that must put every sincere believer on his mettle. The apostolical authority to us says—"Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth," a sentiment which seems to us in perfect harmony with all our great Examplar and Teacher has laid before us. In the refutation of such a conclusion we are met with the text, "If any man provide not for his own he is worse than an infidel," 1 Tim., v. 8. Now we have turned to the proper page, and have perused its contents with a strong desire rightly to read, mark, and inwardly digest it, and it is our conclusion that it has no irrelevancy in it. It was spiritual provision, and not money provision, upon which the Apostle insists.

Page 33.—We have here roundly and plainly asserted one momentous fact, that "Mammon is, *de facto* Lord of the ascendant in our every day world, deny it who may." To this our objector adds the qualification, "*Pro tanto*, the world is condemned." This looks like concession, "By so much the world is condemned." By how much? By having thrown off its allegiance from that divine person it professes to serve, and taken up with the dirty drudgery of a malignant spirit. *Pro tanto!*

The fifth proposition of our category, which appears in the same page, is flatly denied. Have patience with us, Christian reader, this is our position, "That Mammon, the god of wealth, the god of the world, is in an especial, radical, and evangelical sense of the word, Antichrist—the antagonist, the actual, potential, revealed, denounced antagonist of Almighty God under the Christian Dispensation.

Our opponent says, "No"—we answer "Yes!" And that "yes" we shall here consent to place on the single but sacred dictum of the Redeemer himself. He has said, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." The position of antagonism, in which the creature Mammon is here placed, is not of us, nor of any human authority. Our Lord has so postulated and so premised the matter of facts, that no man's "No" can ever successfully assail it.

We perceive that our objector, in his remark on our sentiments expressed in p. 37, charges us with "wrangling."

Now perhaps there never was a time when the art of wrangling, or special pleading, or sophisticating the truth, was carried to such an extent as it is at the present day. At the press, at the bar, in the senate, in the pulpit, wherever inquiry and discussion are to be made, there do we find men of strong minds and towering talents pitted against one another, and each labouring with all his might and energy, first to establish

his own views, and then to pull down the super-structure of his opponent. We have a review *versus* a review; we have counsellor against counsellor; we have leader against leader in both our Houses of Parliament; we have bishops, priests, and deacons engaged in the field of controversy, and all waging a wordy war for the promotion of interests peculiarly their own. All is partisanship.

But what "wranglers" are we, when we first investigate the meaning, and then implicitly submit to the ascertained decisions of the truth as it is proclaimed in the words and ministrations of the Son of God, of God incarnate. We wrangle not when we acquiesce in his testimony — we wrangle not when we maintain his cause. They are the wranglers, aye, and the worst species of wranglers too, who embark on the angry rolling billows of this world's endless and ever fluctuating disputation, without deference to the only pilot that can guide and the only compass that can direct, imagining, no doubt, that they are correctly proceeding on their course, when they are driven about by every breeze of human interest and speculation, and are led more and more astray from the haven of truth and repose.

At p. 39 of our book we refer to "the prudent and careful man, using all his ingenuity, cunning, and contrivance, in procuring the best interest, or usury, or dividends, as the profit of his capital. Here, then, he is expressly violating the Christian prohibition as to

laying up. But, further, how does he employ the proceeds of his provident investment? Does he give to him that asketh, or is he ready to lend to the borrower? Not he, indeed." Our objector here puts a plain question, and inquires—"Is this generally true of the wealthy classes?" We repeat our opponent's question—is this a true libel, or is it a gratuitous calumny? Say ye, who best can tell—say ye, who move in the higher walks of life, whether we traduce our neighbours, or whether we have put forth the words of truth and soberness, of history and fact!

We have quoted, at p. 44, the words of the Tempter to the Redeemer—"All this power will I give unto thee, and the glory; for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it; if thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine." And we ask, "Is it not manifest from these words, that the Evil One has had the riches of the world committed to him?" In reply to this question, the objector exclaims, "What! because the father of lies said so?" We answer, that we do not believe this fact because the father of lies said so, but because it is essential to the integrity of the whole category touching the temptation of our divine Lord and Master, that we hold the testimony as truth. Can our disputant give as good a ground as this for his scepticism?

P. 45.—We have here insisted upon the obligation which lies upon every professing Christian to walk in the steps of his avowed and divine Master. Our com-

mentator tells us—" Not in his supernatural steps." We cannot pass by the observation, although we know that it has no bearing upon our views. We have placed the obligation itself upon our Lord's own precept. He did not require that his followers should tread in his supernatural footsteps, neither do we.

At p. 47 our allegation is, " Christ, by his example, repudiated riches—what do his professing followers? What is the conduct which our most distinguished divines and saints exhibit? What do we find?—conformity and agreement? The reply to these inquiries is given by the splendid equipage, the noble palace, the sumptuous board, the dignity, elegance, ease, and luxury of our right honourable and right reverend prelates."—" Who," says our critic, " give more in charity a hundred-fold than their accusers." No question can arise upon the point of comparison in the *quantum* of giving. The queen gives more away in the name of charity than her nobles; a rich bishop more than his poor curate; and so downwards to us accusers. But this is no refutation of our libel. The position remains untouched. The course of life which very many of our most distinguished divines and saints are pursuing, stands prominently out as discordant and anomalous to the example on which we have ventured to descant. How pertinent to our case is the evangelical history! " And Jesus sat over against the treasury; and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury; and many that were rich cast in much, and there came a certain poor widow, and she cast in two mites, which make a farthing; and he called unto him his disciples,

and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast more in than all they which have cast into the treasury. For all they did cast in of their abundance, but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living."

At p. 53 we inquire—"Did the first Apostles teach the doctrine which is now held forth by the men who arrogate the character of their representatives and successors?" On which our opponent sarcastically remarks, "Arrogate, forsooth!"

Well, suppose we confess an error of judgment here, and admit that the priesthood of our church do derive their sacerdotal office in direct, unbroken line from our Lord's own disciples—that the twelve Apostles each has his double, being now represented by our four-and-twenty bishops—and that, according to the Vicar of Leeds, "their continued descent is evident to every one who chooses to investigate it"—so that "there is not a bishop, priest, or deacon amongst us who cannot, if he pleases, trace his own spiritual descent from St Peter or St Paul.

What is the concession worth? What have the bishops, priests, and deacons to boast of in this their line of ancestry? Men guilty of the most heinous crimes have by this showing been the predecessors of our present bishops, priests, and deacons—men of rapacity—men of cruelty—men of blood—adulterers, fornicators, incestuous.

The boasters of this apostolical succession may say that they speak of the fact, but cannot help the shame. Neither do we impute shame to them on this account. But when they make a boast of their high descent—when they think that they can ride rough-shod over the priests and prelates of all other churches—and when they make plain, practical Christianity a thing of naught by their traditions — then we say, " Arrogance, forsooth !"

We have been taught to believe that " the glory of the Popedom was acquired by holiness of life, and the purity of the doctrine of the bishops of Rome, accompanied with the severest toils, and the most consummate virtue in their proceedings." And we have been used to conclude that profligacy, vice, and crime, would assuredly forfeit all that spirit, morality, and perfect justice could give. But no ! under our Mammonian Dispensation such reasoning is absurd !

At p. 66 we have asked, " Among the many steps or measures to be taken for the purpose of obtaining the end in view, church preferment—which is taken, can be taken, without money? The training of the boy, the education of the adult intended for the church, can these initiatory steps be taken free of Mammon? After the regular schooling, our youth has a college life to lead. Is there no one at the portal there to demand a toll or fee before he enters? Or, when he enters, does he find that all is free from Mammonian influence? His rooms, his furniture, the customs to which he must con-

form, the lectures he is required to attend, the dress he is obliged to wear, his associations, the whole tenor of his progress, all proceed upon money principles, all display the authority of Mammon." For these assertions we are reproached in the following words, "Far from it, honours are as open to the poorest as the richest competitor."

As we have more than once premised, it is absolutely necessary to understand our corrector before we reply to him. If this critique mean that there is no distinction made between the several competitors for *honours* at our universities, because of the wealth or poverty of the several candidates, we have not a word to urge on the point—being ourselves ignorant in the matter. If the critique means that the honour of a University life and training be open alike to rich and poor, all we have to do in vindication of our test is to say, "Go and see." The simple matter of fact is all upon the tapis—plain and open to observation—judge ye, Christian readers! between us.

At p. 64 we have said that by "Divines we mean all those reverend and learned men, grand compounders, great and little sophists, junior and senior wranglers, with all the hosts of right reverends, very reverends, most reverends, doctors, deans, arch prelates, and arch everything—in fact, all who have gradually adopted their views of the Christian Dispensation as their Alma Mater has taught them." Our gentle querist alleges in reply —"Mere ribaldry!" Now Dr Johnson tells us that

ribaldry means "mean, lewd, brutal language." Stand thou between us and our accuser, Christian reader! and say where do you find language like this on our page? If it be mean not to have had a University training—if it be lewd to lament the pomp, the parade, the mere circumstantials with which the office of the professed ministers of Christ is encumbered and degraded—if it be brutal fearlessly to assert the cause of truth, of holiness, and God,—then ribalds, indeed, are we. But in no other sense can we plead guilty to the charge.

We are told that we are guilty of "obloquy," that is, of defamation and slander, when we state of the upper ranks of the clergy, that "they say to the poor and needy of the flock, Go ye and teach all nations, while they take good care to stay at home to enjoy their dignities, their emoluments, and gains." This, it is alleged, is "Obloquy."

Let the reader look into the matter. Is our statement true or false? It is easily susceptible of demonstration. Obloquy means false accusation. The commission, "Go ye and teach all nations," is of divine origin—it is the commission which every clergyman, *quasi* apostle, has received, and upon which it is his imperative duty to act. Are our spiritual barons, or deans, or prebendaries, or incumbents, as such, missionaries or apostles? No! they settle down in their palaces, their mansions, their excellent parsonages, their rich livings, and they abandon to others the character of instructors of the heathen, and evangelizers of the world.

We say, p. 72—"Turn to the precept, 'Lay not up treasure upon earth.' Why, some of our modern saints—almost all of them who have the opportunity, are numbered among the most inveterate hoarders and accumulators in the length and breadth of the land." To this our objector exclaims, "Gratuitous assertion, and how untrue!"

The assertion is gratuitous in one sense of the word, it was uncalled for,—perhaps our argument does not stand in need of any such exemplification. But that it is *untrue* we must take the liberty to deny. We could at once name more than half a dozen men, who hold themselves, and are held by others, as Saints of our age and land, who are "inveterate hoarders and accumulators." We will not, however, involve our little work in a personal controversy upon any such point: if the reader doubts the truth of the assertion, we should recommend him to contemplate, more closely than he has done hitherto, the worldly pursuits of those men who class with the distinguished SAINTS of the TIMES. We have done this, and cannot retract the "*gratuitous assertion.*

The same spirit of defamation is imputed to us when, at p. 73, we inquire, "Do we scandalize any one when we say that our rich men—that our rich Christian (so called) men, are more inhuman, more heartless, than the untutored savage or the sanguinary cannibal." Our examiner writes—"To be sure you do."

We shall be content here to repeat the argument by

which we have already justified this aspersion—"Look ye now. How wild soever the sooty Indian is, will he suffer a fellow Indian to perish, he having abundance —as our rich and luxurious professors do? And how horrible soever the festivals of the cannibals may be, is it not under the strong impulse of revenge, an uncontrollable sense of injury, that he gluts himself with the blood of his enemy? If this be so, there is nothing defamatory in this article of indictment against the rich—the rich saints and professors of our age and country. The fact is, they sit at home, faring sumptuously every day, in the full enjoyment of all the luxuries of existence, while they know that many a fellow-creature is perishing by inches around them for lack of the common necessaries of life." This fact, this state of things, which is as open and notorious as the sun at noon day, justifies the charge in question. Where, then, is the Christianity of the age?

Who shall mitigate the condemnation here uttered upon the inhumanity, the cruelty of the sins in question? It is the condemnation of Jesus of Nazareth!

We find that our objector, upon our remarks, adverts to names and persons—"*Thornton, Wilberforce, Martin, and such like,*" are put forward as persons who, in imitation of the example of Jesus of Nazareth, became poor in order that others, through their poverty, might become rich.

We shall neither admit nor deny the inference in-

tended by this personal exemplification. We do not know that any of these persons fall under the lash of our censure; neither do we know that any one of them made such a sacrifice of self as would entitle him to exception. We cannot retract the charge; upon living characters it falls.

At p. 77 we ask, "Is it a truth that all our national institutions are based on wealth, cemented by wealth?"

To which our critic appends the monosyllable "*No.*"

And then we demand, "Is it a truth that the god, or genius, of this wealth is all antagonism with the spirit and genius of the Christian Dispensation?"

To which "*a nonentity*" is underscribed.

We have already given our answer to this objection. We have not created, we have not imagined, the *real entity* or existence of such a creature, or being, as Mammon. We have not given a character or nature to this being. It is all done ready to our hands; done by ONE who must have thoroughly understood his subject. If *nonentity* belongs to the work of this ONE, then the Christian is afloat everywhere upon a troubled and bottomless ocean.

So also with the first of these two queries—that "all

our national institutions are based on wealth, are cemented by wealth."

What means this monosyllable "No?" Which of the institutions spoken of has risen into existence without the aid of money? Which of them could stand at all without this cement? Would the church, the most sacred of all our establishments, stand for a moment without its revenues, its endowments, its opulence? Take from the church its wealth, and what would become of the loudest of its advocates, and apparently the most zealous of its friends? The fact we have asserted is too evident to be successfully denied.

At p. 80 our friend imagines that he has detected a contradiction in our premises. We here say that the "Gospel is now actually preached and published in all the world as a witness to all nations;"—under which this question is inscribed.

"How can this be when all the preachers are in league with Antichrist?"

Brother, brother, we greet you well; this is just an objection that suits our purpose. You cannot tell how it is possible that a man who is subservient to Mammon can preach the Gospel. Then we will inform you.

Can you imagine how Annanias, and Sapphira his wife, might concur in commending the Gospel whilst they were undoubtedly in league with Mammon? Can

you imagine how the bishops, priests, and deacons, of the church of Rome preach the Gospel, through the length and breadth of the land, whilst you hold that they are all arch-apostates from the true faith? Can you imagine how it is that many whom you know to be under the influence of mercenary motives, are at this hour engaged in professedly promoting the cause of truth and holiness? Why, this supposed impossibility is one of the easiest possibilities in the world; and the combination of apparent zeal with selfish motive, is one of the objects most frequently presented to our attention in this every-day world.

At p. 98 we have stated that "a Christian Conservative is an anomalous, self-contradictory, heterogeneous character;" and we ask, "what is the first wish, the most earnest prayer, the sincerest act, of the Conservative? Is it not to say *esto perpetua* to things as they are? Is it aot his maxim that all things are just as they should be?" Our corrector does not approve of our reply, he substitutes his own. He says that "the object of the Conservative is to maintain what God has ordained, to honour his institutions, to preserve sacred things from unholy violation and destructive revilings." We have not the least objection to adopt this substituted reply; with only this condition, that we take care to descriminate between that which God, in his ineffable wisdom, hath ordained, and that which fallen man, in his many foolish inventions, has put in its place.

The point of our argument is, however, lost sight of

here. We again would ask whether any rational being can, at one and the same time, admit that the world is in a dreadfully lapsed and depraved condition, and yet cry *esto perpetua* to things as they are? We honour no institution that either prostitutes the divine attributes for its aggrandisement, or that throws any obstacle in the way of the Christian Dispensation: and this because we are sure that no such institution can be from above. If every such institution, by whatever name known, by whatever character distinguished, must, as a matter of moral necessity, be swept away when the Redeemer's kingdom shall be established on the earth, how is it possible, in the nature of things, for that man to be a consistent Christian, by whom such an institution is perpetuated and sustained?

When at p. 110 we say, that "All contrivances have been adopted how to get the labour of the poor at the lowest possible price, and how to keep the destitute alive at the least possible cost"—our objector says, "Not one, with that object or motive." Why, verily, the object or motive of those who have done so much to cheapen the value of labour can hardly be doubtful. Their own gain, no doubt, was both motive and object.

When in the same page we say, that "Riches are a certain snare to those who place their reliance upon them"—our opponent exclaims, "How refreshing this accent of truth and soberness!" We rejoice that he should feel himself refreshed by any accents that we can utter. The sentiment here repeated may be found on

almost every page of our little book. Riches, we repeat, constitute the snare—the fatal snare—into which every Christian falls who does not dispose of those riches just as his divine Lord and Master has commanded him.

"I say that the poorest man amongst us has an infinitely greater stake in the laws made for the protection of property than the richest man alive can have."

Is not this a monstrous, an absurd, aye, an insane proposition? The utterer cannot mean what he says. He most likely intends to say that under the old Poor Law—the statute of Elizabeth—every destitute person was legally entitled to protection and support from the common fund raised by the poor rates. But is not this to evade, rather than meet, the object ostensibly, as well as really, sought for in the laws for the protection of property?

These laws are made to give security to the investments of the rich, and to deter the poor from making any infraction thereupon. In what sense, then, can it be said that the poor have so great a stake, or any stake, therein?

In plain truth, these laws are made for the purpose of keeping up the strange, unnatural, and Anti-christian *distribution of property* which yet prevails in our Mammon-ridden world: and the marvel is that Mammon should so long be permitted to sophisticate, bewitch, and sorcerize the minds of professing, ay, of consecrated

Christians. But so it is, and the reverend gentleman who gave utterance to the above-written proposition, would as soon forfeit his right hand as abandon his ground.

Now, is it right, or is it wrong? Is it a truth, or is it a falsehood that Mammon—the antagonist of the Christian Dispensation—is lord of the ascendant in all these things? There is no middle ground in the case: we cannot render a divided service.

At p. 114 we say, "The man who will suffer the light of Christianity to shine upon his politics will have no difficulty in finding whence originates all the toil and turmoil, the crime and prostitution, he sees in every direction around him, whereas the man who is wedded to things as they are, on whose tongue the word, (No surrender) ever sits, and whose heart is under the influence of self-love, will never know how the world is to be regenerated and redeemed by the Gospel. It will be just the same with the highest prelate, his Grace the Archbishop, as with the earliest neophyte in our schools of learning; all that the little soph or senior wrangler; all that the master of arts or the doctor of divinity; all that the venerable and most venerable, the right reverend and most gracious divine, will otherwise either learn or inculcate, amounts to plausible delusion and self-deceit."

Upon this passage our opponent exclaims, and in

wrath too, "*Cometh this scurrilous railing* against *reputable distinctions, from the Spirit of Christ or of Antichrist? From the meekness of the Saviour or from worldly pride?*"

The proper answer to such a query is, from neither of these sources. Why should it issue from either one or the other? It cometh from *observation.*

"*Scurrilous railing!*" Christian reader, judge thou. "Grossly opprobrious; using such language as only the licence of a buffoon can warrant; lewdly jocular; vile; low"—this is Dr Johnson's interpretation of the word scurrilous: and, apt to our purpose, he takes the following passage from the writings of Addison as an example:—

"How often is a person, whose intentions are to do good by the works he publishes, treated in as scurrilous a manner as if he were an enemy to mankind?"

The immortal Milton has well expressed the libel which we—not having, as heretofore, the fear of church before our eyes—the libel which we have uttered:—

> "——— they seek t' avail themselves of names,
> Places, and titles; and with these to join
> Secular power, though feigning still to act
> By spiritual."

Say then, Christian reader, "*Cometh this scurrilous*

railing against reputable distinctions from the spirit of *Christ or of Anti-christ? From the meekness of the Saviour, or from worldly pride?"* We are the party now impeached, and are willing to abide thy judgment; this we say of our little book, Christian reader. For ourselves, we make no reply. The reproof may be just. Pride reigns in many a heart that is perfectly unconscious of the fact. The question is a searcher; we will oft repeat it to ourselves.

Our language at p. 125 is—"You may say that as a good citizen, a good subject, a prudent and provident member of society, it is your duty to foster and fructify, as much as you can, the property to which you have attained. Your reply is admitted. But what does it amount to? It goes to this point, and there sinks again into its native obliquity. It leads to this fearful, this infidel conclusion, that Jesus of Nazareth never meant that his followers should do as he bade them, that the law and the testimony of his mouth are figurative ONLY; that the Christian Dispensation is a mere Utopian scheme, a visionary tale of times that never will be."

Our opponent says, "Not only, but beyond all question *partly, e. g.*, 'If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.'"

It is not our province to make our divine Lord and

Master at one with himself in all his words and actions —nor is it for us nicely to discriminate between that which is to be plainly and literally taken, and that which is to be considered as bold hyperbole and figure, throughout the Gospel. But here we are charged with so confounding and so blending the two modes of instruction, as to warrant false conclusions. The course of the Christian reader of the Gospels is plain. There is explicit precept—there is metaphorical representation—there is direct command—there is figurative explanation. Easy must it be to perceive the difference. It is not for us now to advance propositions in support of our principle.

When we come to p. 130, we find our premises strongly contradicted. "Falsely" is applied to the assertion of the Tempter, when he said that he had power to dispose of the glory of the world. And the monosyllable "No" follows our inference, that it is the Tempter who now endows the rich man with an absolute right to do what he will with his own.

We have no concession to make in the reconsideration of the subject which these corrections produce. We read the matters of fact as gospel revelations of truth, and place implicit confidence in them.

The choler of our censor is moved when, at p. 131, we affirm that "the laws of nature, the laws of Almighty God, the laws of the Christian Dispensation, have been violated and trampled upon for the aggrandisement of

the rich, and for the debasement of the poor." He says, "Truly a Tract for the 'Times,' what wholesome hints!" We request our readers again and again to reflect on the subject matter of this page. We are confident that our ministers of state cannot occupy their minds upon any subject of greater importance. Is the truth simply and fairly stated there? Have our lawgivers so constructed our national code (for the protection of property) as that they (the laws) trample on the laws of Nature—of common humanity,—on the laws of Nature's God,—and, more especially, on the laws of the Christian Dispensation? If this be our case, then whosoever avers it, or whosoever contradicts it, is of no consequence; we do not "*hint*;" we assert that so it is.

At p. 133, we speak of the rich and mighty revelling in the wealth of which the labourers have been *defrauded*. To which the counter assertion has been appended—"*have not been defrauded.*"

Our *phrase*, it is seen, is taken from the Bible: the evidence of our statement, as to the *fraudulent oppression* to which the labourer, the robust, honest, and sober labourer, is, in this our day, made the victim, meets with confirmation to whatever quarter we direct our consideration.

Casting our thoughts onward, and inquiring how the dreary state of things in which we are living may find a remedy, we have put the question, "Whence is the remedial process to proceed? How shall the productive members of human society assert and vin-

dicate their rights, their heaven-born rights, their God-bestowed rights, the rights of themselves, their daughters, and their sons?"

To this our corrector replies, "By honouring all men, fearing God, and honouring the King."

The 'Times' newspaper would call this *twaddle;*—a vulgar word, but very pointed. How can the oppressed and almost starved labourer honour the rich man who oppresses him?—or how honour a King that approves of the miseries he suffers? Who shall say that he does not Fear GOD? Who shall say that it is not this very fear, his reverence and love towards GOD, that give him now that patient endurance which we witness of all the evils to which he is rendered obnoxious? Our censor has his opinion on this point, so we have ours. May GOD preserve the Poor!

At p. 134, following out our counsel to the disaffected district, we have said, "These four monosyllables 'WE WANT OUR OWN,' so carried to the foot of the throne, laid on the threshold of the church, posted near the palaces of your bishops, forced upon the view of the nobility and squirearchy of the land, must be heard; and thus the maxim shall be realized, "VOX POPULI, VOX DEI."

To this passage the objector appends the following inquiry:—"Who is to be caterer, and hold the scales?"

We cannot be sure that we quite understand the full tenor of our querist's query. "Caterer" means one who selects and lays in the family provision; the *provider* or purveyor for the circle. Such an one does not hold the scales; this office belongs to him who weighs out the said provender or provision. The question then is twofold: first, Who, when the defrauded labourer demands his own, shall determine how much that, his own, is? and then, secondly, measure or weigh out to him just his due? If this be the sense of the question, then we also exclaim with our fellow complainant, "Who is equal to these things?"

Our second paragraph in p. 135 stands thus:—"Christianity is a humanizing system. Its object is to make men sympathize for each other, and bear each other's burdens. But how little is this object practically recognized in this Mammon-ridden world! The God of Nature, of Revelation, of Christianity, has given to the honest and industrious a right to the adequate reward of their labour—a right paramount to that which any crowned or coronetted head can show. But the whole aristocracy of wealth have confederated together against this right; and in direct opposition to it, the rich, the royal, the noble, the powerful, and the privileged of the earth, stand in battle array."

The demand made upon this paragraph is—"Are all tributary to it?" Tributary to what? To Christianity as a humanizing system—as a profession which is calculated to make men sympathize with each other? We

answer, "Yes!"—self-evident it is, that every Christian either is or ought to be tributary to this dispensation.

Three notable specimens of acute criticism occur in the animadversions made upon the sentiments advanced in p. 136. Our allegation is, that the first object for which the new Poor Laws were enacted was for the better security and protection of the property of the rich. "No!" says our friend, "not of the rich, but for the security of property, a principle in which the poor are interested as well as the rich."

Perhaps the anxious supplication which the great patron and propounder of the Poor Laws, that wonderful man, the Right Honourable Lord Brougham, enounced on his knees before the House of Lords, may be as bright an elucidation on this point as we can give—"My Lords, as you value your estates, as you hold your property sacred, I conjure you, pass this Bill."

"We do not call the rich man, as such, to look at these things and count his gains, but the Christian as such;—let him say whether it is not cajolery, sophistry, sorcery all."

"None," writes our commentator, and then he adds, "vastly more before."

One of the most extraordinary signs of the times, or features of our age, is this,—that men of superior judgments, of extensive experience, of a vast field for obser-

vation, should take such opposite views, first of the fundamental principles, and next of the actual operation of these new Poor Laws. But the greater marvel is, that sound and sober Christians should range themselves under the new Poor Law system. We give up the controversy; but retain our first opinion, which is, in the words of the late renowned Lord Eldon, of conservative celebrity, "The Poor Law Amendment Act is the most execrable and atrocious law ever made."

At p. 138 we have imputed darkness, mental blindness, gross and deep delusion, to those Mammonists who prefer the present mode of providing for the poor and needy to that which the statute of Elizabeth had created. For this our censor thus sarcastically upbraids us—"modest and enlightened!"

We can elicit nothing like argument from such ejaculatory triumphs, and must therefore leave our opponent in possession of the field of display.

We find that at p. 139 we have a flat and unqualified contradiction of premises hitherto advanced, and now reasoned upon—namely, that the fair hire of the honest, robust, and sober labourer, is fraudulently withheld from him. Our respondent says, "It is not withheld."

After this it is demanded of us, "What does this mean?"—that is the proposal made in a book given to the world a year or two ago under the cognomen, 'Mar-

cus,' wherein the policy is explained of stifling every child that poor people may beget after their second one, alive.

This project appears at first sight more brutal than the scheme which Dr Malthus and Miss Martineau have pressed upon the consideration of the wise in their generation. But the whole difference consists in this; the latter scheme is to prevent the procreation of children, whilst the former proposes to crush them at life's portal. Either project, we opine, is too disgusting to be tolerated in Christendom.

A few pages after we have the longest note of objurgation yet administered. It is couched in our respondent's most sarcastic style.

"What can England do?" is the title of a little book which was before us when this page was penned.

Our answer is—"EVANGELIZE the people, and denounce the despot Mammon." O dear no, saith our critic, but "*destroy the parsons—down with the churches—put fools'-caps on your D. D.'s—give your wranglers a doll—see a demon in every coronet, and count a purse a devil.*"

This is meant for satire, and we are not satirists; we believe that there is a certain sort of temper in the objection, which will fret and exhaust itself in the mere

rehearsal: it does not touch our case. Our advice still is, evangelize the people, both in their minds and in their conditions, and leave the rest to heaven.

"The saints and sages," we affirm at p. 142, "as well as the sceptics, say that the Redeemer could not have meant that his precepts should be taken in a literal sense; that his words must be distorted, adapted, wrested from their proper construction; and that natural ideas must be modified and changed. And why? because the existing order of things would be dislocated, the present state of society disturbed, the peace of a slumbering world broken in upon; some such frivolous pretence as this is adduced, and therefore the Redeemer's commands are to be disobeyed, and his plain declarations are to be misinterpreted."

Our corrector is manifestly puzzled by this bold position. His answer stands thus—"*Not for these reasons, but that he may be honoured by a common-sense understanding of his word.*"

How can we offer a rejoinder to such an observation? A good, plain, common-sense understanding, with a direct, palpable, and practical application of the precepts of the Redeemer, is exactly that for which we contend. We know that existing institutions must fall before such an understanding and such an administration of Christianity. The immortal Canning knew that also; and therefore he, like a wise and prudent statesman, "deprecated the

introduction of Christian principles too boldly into this house,"—the house of our legislature.

Another sarcastic fling is made at our sentiments at p. 143. We say, "This is the sum and the substance of our case; who shall refute it? Who shall refuse to give it his most serious consideration? Mammon is Antichrist—Mammon, the god of wealth—Mammon, the god of the world—Mammon, the prince of the power of the air—Mammon, the master spirit and ruling genius of all our national institutions—HE is the antagonist—the actual, personal, potential, revealed, denounced antagonist of Almighty God under the Christian Dispensation—to us, our age and nation—to us, our homes and altars—to the throne, to the nobles, to the gentry, to the common people of our times. This is a plain saying, and defies the most subtle sophistication. Is it true, or is it false? Jesus of Nazareth says, it is true."

To this our reviewer annexes the words "No! the author says so;"—meaning, no doubt, that the assertion rests upon the mere *ipse dixit* of the tract before you, Christian reader.

There is nothing like bold assertion and hard words; they always recoil upon those who use them in a bad cause. Have you patience, Christian reader, to test our assertion—first, by the testimony of Jesus, as that testimony is recorded upon our universally received Gospels

—and next by the lessons of daily experience and common observation? If our reader is disposed to pursue this open course, we have only to put this volume into his hands, and we trust that he will rise from its perusal convinced that our great principle is identical with the express testimony of the Great Teacher of eternal truth.

The last page of our book is encumbered with three remarks—What shall we do with them?

"Must go to the Gospel again, for its lessons have been quite mistaken."

"Is the temper of this work capable of a dispassionate investigation?"

"Nevertheless able and eloquent."

Reader, we ask again—What shall we do with such observations as these? Go to the Gospel again? Why, the main premises of this little tract were printed and published, and addressed to the Lord Bishop of London, full ten years ago. During the whole of this period we have always had the Gospel in hand, and our convictions have been incalculably strengthened by the repeated investigation of the subject.

"Quite mistaken!" This is to beg the whole question. Our opponent avers that we are mistaken. It is of no use for us to meet that averment with a counter assertion.

Mistaken! We must repeat our premises until the faint negative now given to them be completely silenced. You say, Christian reader, that you hold the Bible which we all possess to be the word of God—more especially that the Gospels—the evangelical records—are words of revelation to all believers. Now say, is it not there recorded—even from the mouth of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ himself—that Mammon is the antagonist of the Christian Dispensation? We call upon you to take first the identical words employed by our Lord and Saviour; (Matt. vi, 24, Luke xvi, 13;) then to examine the contexts, then to try the sense or spirit in which these words are addressed to us by every other parallel passage or analagous declaration, whether it be prescriptive or parabolical—and thus taking the whole—all that our Divine Teacher has put upon record as his revelation to us—we say, how can any consistent Christian deny our position—Mammon, Antichrist? Mistaken! Christian reader, thou sittest in the judgment-seat between us and our opponent. Thou canst easily refer to that source of intelligence and truth before which we must all bend. Say, then, is the temper—ay, the temper of this work, "capable"—susceptible—"of a dispassionate investigation?" We appeal to you if our temper is not that of implicit submission to "the truth" —the truth, which we boldly and confidently maintain in proportion to our conviction of its infinite importance. We repeat it, Christian reader! you are the judge between us.

We may boldly venture, upon this discovery as to

fallacies which obtain in the authorized translation of the Bible, to submit whether there are not some other phrases in that ancient book, which give—not merely a faint and fallacious, but—a false and *impious* representation of some of the divine attributes? For instance, we frequently read of the *wrath* of GOD; of the soul of GOD being *avenged* on man; "*vengeance* is mine;" "I will cause my *fury* to rest upon them, so I will be *comforted*;" "GOD is jealous, and the Lord *revengeth*; the Lord revengeth, and is *furious*;" "consuming fire;" with many other words of a similar sense.

Our divine Teacher himself, who is Immanuel—GOD with us—used none of these expressions; exhibited none of these passions. His precursor, John, it is true, speaks of "the *wrath* of GOD" abiding on the man who refuses to receive salvation from the Son of GOD. The apostle Paul also frequently employs the same figures of speech, when he would work upon the hopes, or rather the *fears*, of his auditors; we cannot, nevertheless, help indulging the conviction that the day dawns upon us when all good Christians, looking to the author and finisher of their faith as their great and only example, will leave such representations of Deity as fit only for the bats and owls which fly in the twilight, and to the moles which burrow in darkness.

The Christian, to be consistent with himself, must put his trust in ONE who is the perfect counterpart or antidote of all this—"a bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench;"—in ONE

who "will strengthen the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees." (See Isaiah, xlix.) We *learn* of him, who comforts the mourner, and has invited the weary and the heavy laden to rest.

In short, the Christian's GOD is not a jealous God; is not a consuming fire; has no soul to be avenged on his enemies; cannot be in a fury; but, on the contrary, he is all grace and beneficence, all goodness to all those who will seek him and will put their trust in him. To the unbelieving Jew, then, and to the Old Testament worshipper, will these words of our divine Teacher aptly apply, "Go ye and learn what that meaneth,—*I will have* MERCY, *and not* SACRIFICE."

"The Bible, the Bible, the Bible!"—this is the cuckoo-cry of all those persons who now stand before the world *in loco* the saints of the age;—Oh! the Bible!

We say the Bible too; but then we believe that there is a great deal in the Bible which neither we nor the most astute saints of the age can clearly understand. We cannot apprehend it, first, because the truth is intentionally wrapt up in mystical language; and next, because such truths are not either essential or material to a right knowledge of our REDEMPTION by JESUS CHRIST. Hence, then, we take the liberty of discriminating between the Old and the New Testaments; and then, after that, we do not attempt to unravel the *hard sayings* of the Apostle Paul; and we desire, "in the *face*

of JESUS CHRIST," to find the essence and substance of the Bible, as the word of GOD—the word of revelation and truth—the word of will and commandment—the word of reconciliation and redemption.

We plainly, however, perceive one *principle* pervading every page of this sacred book, which is immediately pertinent to our case and argument: the *principle* is this, that man must *obey* before he can enjoy. Obey and live! rebel and die! is an everlasting *fiat* or principle which pervades the whole Bible, and seems to us as an especial part of the covenant which in his grace our triune GOD has entered into with his rational creatures. "Ye shall do my judgments, and keep my ordinances, to walk therein: which if a man do, he shall live in them; I am the Lord." This is the word of GOD to his ancient people.—"If a man love me, he will keep my commandments." This is the word of Jesus Christ—the same GOD—to all of us who now affect to call him Lord and Master.

And this *principle*, we would maintain, is not only perfect and divine in itself, but it is of universal application also. No man shall, in any kind or degree, adopting the spirit of the Gospel, act upon its principles, and obey its precepts, without finding his reward in kind and degree—without finding his advantage therein. "He shall live in them;" live the life that his Creator, his Redeemer, his Sanctifier, would have him to live.

Thus saith the Bible from first to last. But does the

New Testament throw no new light upon this great fundamental doctrine? Is there nothing peculiar, nothing new, in the life and ministry of Jesus of Nazareth? in the precepts, the prescription, and parables of the Lord GOD our REDEEMER? Has not HE "brought both life and immortality to light by the GOSPEL?" showing us "the way, the truth, and the life?" Why, then, should we go back to the mysteries, why wander in the labyrinths, why dwell upon the developments of old dispensations? We will tell you how it is that this occurs, Christian reader. It is because that we are all Mammon-ridden, saints and sinners,* the most serious and pious, as well as the most reprobate and dissolute; and because

MAMMON IS ANTICHRIST.

Instead, then, of going, as we are directed, to the BIBLE as a whole, we prefer the New Testament, and more especially the Gospels, as our test of Christian truth.

This is no new objection that we are controverting. It is narrated in our Gospel, immediately following these words of our Lord, "Ye cannot serve GOD and Mammon," that "the Pharisees, who were *covetous*, heard all these things, derided him," and that thereupon he said unto them, "Ye are they which justify yourselves be-

* "We believe that any degree of inconsistency may be accounted for by the prejudices of education; and the more reverential and religious the mind, the closer very often will the prejudices cling." —*Rivington's Theological Review, No.* LV, *p.* 55, *note.*

fore men; but GOD knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of GOD. The law and the prophets were *until* John: *since* that time the kingdom of GOD is preached." (Luke xvi, 15, 16.)

The apostle Paul speaks specifically to the same point. "GOD, who, at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath, in *these last days*, spoken unto us by his Son." (Hebrews, iv, 1, 2.) And thus the apostle reasons with us on the subject. He says, "For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast,"—"how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the *first began* to be spoken by the Lord?" (Hebrews, ii, 3.)

The Evangelist John had previously determined the matter: he says, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and *truth came* by Jesus Christ." (i, 17.) Just as the voice from heaven had pronounced, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye him."

What becomes of the preachings of those learned persons who insist upon it that we Christians must interpret the words of our Lord and Master by something that Moses and the prophets gave to the world of old? *Biblical*, their pleadings may be, but *evangelical* they certainly are not.

Does the Christian believer, when he reads the Word —when he contemplates the character and conduct of

his divine Lord and Master in the Gospels—does he stand in need of such illustrations and exemplifications as the Old Testament affords?

Our reply to this question is, that just as the sun, which is the centre and source of all light in the firmament of our heaven, eclipses the light of the moon and stars, so does the light of the Gospels eclipse the light of the Old Testament. And so (to bring this reply to bear upon the immediate object of this essay), we submit, that though it may have pleased Almighty GOD, under certain by-gone dispensations, to make the gift of riches palpable marks of his divine favour, it is not so under the dispensation which Jesus Christ hath planted on our earth.

Now let us attend to the word and will of Almighty GOD upon the question at issue,—that is the *paramount* importance and effulgence of the NEW TESTAMENT.

In the first place, the Christian hears a voice *direct* from Heaven, saying,—"This is MY beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye HIM." In the voice of inspiration he hears, we are told next, that this Son was both,—"A light to lighten the GENTILES, and to be the glory of ISRAEL."—"In *him* was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehendeth it not."—("*He was a burning and a shining;*") "that true light which lighteth every man." And what hath the Redeemer said of himself touching this question?—"Then spake Jesus

again unto them, saying,—"I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. I am the light of the world. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light."

To this it is replied, "He said also, These things have I spoken to you in proverbs;" that is, as an excellent commentator has it, in the obscurity of parables, which have appeared dark and mysterious to you. He said also, "Search the Scriptures (the *Old Testament*), for in them ye think (*i. e.* rightly think) ye have eternal life, and they are they which *testify of me.*" Again, he said, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he *wrote of me.* But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"

"Without a parable spake he not unto them, and when they were alone he expounded all things unto his disciples."

"Great," says St Paul, "is the *mystery of* godliness;" *i. e.* the subjects and dispensations declared in the Gospel. Now we see through a glass darkly. These are sufficient to show the tendency of taking certain passages of Scripture irrespectively of others. The same happens generally in taking the New Testament irrespectively of the Old. They are parts of one system, and cannot be *opposed* to each other. Our Saviour expressly adduced and sanctioned the *law* and the prophets,

and the Psalms, as concerning himself,—not as explaining *his precepts*, but revealing "the sun of righteousness" about to arise. The one shows the history of our race, of our nature and character, and the dealings and relations of God to mankind, from the beginning up to the time of the supplemental dispensation of the Messiah. Who would understand a work by only attending to its supplement? Even with respect to the preceptive character of the Old Testament, it is very important to admit its transcendent excellence (not transcending the Gospel indeed). "I believe," says an excellent authority, "we shall find that every duty of morality, whatsoever things are honest, just, and pure, are therein most completely taught and most powerfully enforced."

So we conclude that "The day-spring from on high hath visited *us*, to give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death," (had not these the Scriptures of Moses, of David, of Solomon, and the prophets?) "to guide *our* feet into the way of peace." That the above are express citations from the *Old Testament*, made by Zacharias in the New, prompted by the Holy Ghost.

The risen sun culminates to its meridian height, and makes every minor planet hide its diminished front.

Christian reader, the question is in your hands; dispose of it as you please. Your verdict is for your own government. The immutability of God's laws, and the unchangeable nature of moral obligation or virtue, we

would contend for quite as strenuously as our opponent. But how does this doctrine bear upon our *assertion?* All nature confirms the proposition here propounded; but our assertion goes to this, that our CREATOR and *heavenly* FATHER has *revealed* himself to us Christians under a *new aspect*, and in *brighter colours*, in the New Testament than he has under the Old. How say you?

"Does not eclipse in the sense of a competing or rivalling light."

The supposition that we have advanced any such thought is the objector's own imagination. We are quite of his opinion in the matter; the competing or rivalling powers of the several heavenly orbs are all in perfect harmony; the whole is co-operation, beauty, fertility.

It will be obvious to most readers of this controversy, we opine, that the objections here raised against the theory, or argument of our risen sun illustration, are set on mistaken ground. The objector attacks those who would set aside or dispense with the light emanating from the books of the Testament; whereas our allegory or simile does no such thing. Quite the contrary, we love the moonlight walk; the twinkling, the order of the stars; the eternal fixedness of those which have not budged the thousandth part of an inch since the day of their creation; and the marvellous uniformity of those which have both their daily and yearly march to make; —O! they all conspire to lift us from our own planet,

and to make us creatures of ethereal fabric! But when the Sun ariseth, puts on strength, and so shines forth, that the comparatively dim light of all other bodies is totally eclipsed,—why, then, we do not put by our work, and say, let us wait and see what effect the shine of the moon and stars will have upon it.

This is the way we act in the matter on which our reprover says, "Rather is he bound to take the whole system of Revelation as GOD has promulgated it, and will he not take distorted views if he do not?" * We stop not to ask how far it may suit the ancient institutions of our world that the truth should appear;—but we again put it to the reader—which is the truth according to gospel testimony? Does Almighty God preside over the wealth of the world? Or does he, in his inscrutable providence, yet allow the great adversary of man, Satan, to have the ascendancy in the distribution of riches?

It is objected to us—"You impute artifice and subterfuge to us who insist that the Bible, as an entirety, must be resorted to before a sound faith or right practice, as a Christian, can be ascertained."

We answer, No; but we impute something more than artifice and subterfuge to those who, by their

* We have put a period where the criticism stands with a comma after the words "promulgated it," and added a note of interrogation to the subsequent words.

studies, would adumbrate or pollute the pure light of the Gospel, by any of the dark passages of the Old Testament;—we impute *infatuation* and *hallucination* to such persons.

For our authority on the point, we take the *example* of the Apostle Paul; and then put forth our meaning, in this grave accusation, by the same Apostle's simple words.

Did this Apostle preach the Old Testament or the Gospel on every occasion? He speaks of himself, saying, "I am an Apostle separated to the Gospel of GOD, whom I serve with my spirit in the Gospel of his Son." "Wo unto me if I preach not the Gospel." To every Mammon-ridden *generation* priest the *wo now is* if he do preach the Gospel as Jesus Christ uttered it.

The words of the Apostle, which express our present charge to the worldlings of our times, are those he addressed to the apostate Galatians: "Who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth?"

Remember now, Christian reader, what our hypothesis really is—forget the frailty, forget the frivolity, with which we have opened our case. We have supposed, and do premise, that it is a deep delusion, a subtle fallacy, a pernicious dogma, to say that the wealth of our depraved and degenerate world is to him that has it a sacred deposit, a gift of grace or true fit from Almighty God. We have supposed, and do premise, that another

being, one who is the great adversary of man, the ostensible antagonist of the Redeemer's kingdom—that this being has been allowed (by a Providence wholly inscrutable by human wisdom) to order and determine the distribution of that wealth. That is to say, we have premised, on the authority of him who alone can thoroughly understand the subject, that the genius or spirit of this worldly wealth is, in an especial, emphatic, and most comprehensive sense of the words, the antagonist of the Christian Dispensation now on the earth. To all this we add a parting remark—the sooner the above fallacy, delusion, and vicious interpretation of the Almighty's will and word in this great matter is exploded, the better it will be for us all.

We do not ask what the rich of this world say to our doctrine; neither do we consult the poor. We do not expect that any of our bishops, priests, or deacons will concur in our doctrine; no—neither do we ask here what prophets and apostles have advanced upon the subject.* And why not? You have our answer, Christian reader; Jesus Christ hath spoken thereon in terms that are all simplicity, perspicuity, and truth. He has stated the truth, propounded the truth, and exemplified the truth, by every available illustration.

Our hypothesis consists of words; words are the pro-

* The Apostle says clearly, the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, but that, after faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.—Gal. iii, 24, 25.

per vehicles of ideas, and these our ideas fall upon persons and things. We ask you to take our case—word by word, piece by piece: give to each its native, legitimate, evangelical sense; and then, as a whole, say if we have not laid before you as momentous a fact, as important a truth, as man can utter.

Take our fact, take our truth out into the world with you, it shall be not a *sign* only of those things which are coming on the earth, but also it will prove a valuable TOUCHSTONE for things as they are. It will show you how and why it is that our kingdom shakes upon its basis; how and why it is that our institutions are in open collision one with another; how it is that our own law-makers and law-officers are in battle array.

It will show you that the church of Rome (though subject) is not Antichrist—that the church of England (though subject) is not Antichrist; that the lusts of the flesh generally are not Antichrist—but that Mammon, the God of worldly wealth, is the Antichrist of the DIVINE BOOK OF REVELATIONS.

THE END.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY CHARLES REYNELL,
LITTLE PULTENEY STREET.